

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

JANUARY
1920

TO GEORGE BERNARD SHAW

JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

HENRY NEUMANN

THE CASE FOR POLITICAL
ACTION

JAMES ONEAL

A TALK WITH TOM MANN

WALTER G. FULLER

WHEN THE DEVIL WAS SICK

B. N. LANGDON-DAVIES

Published by the

INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

ROOM 914, EDUCATIONAL BUILDING, 70 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, N. Y.

Contents

TO GEORGE BERNARD SHAW Jessie Wallace Hughan . . . Page	65	INJUNCTIONS IN POLITICS G. N. Page	96
THE CASE FOR POLITICAL ACTION James Oneal Page	66	PROBLEMS OF THE REVOLU- TIONIZED ORDER Harry W. Laidler Page	97
WHEN THE DEVIL WAS SICK B. N. Langdon-Davies . . . Page	71	WHY MEXICO? Louis P. Lochner Page	102
AMERICAN IMPERIALISM Henry Neumann Page	76	THE PRESENT STATUS OF SOCIALISM IN AMERICA (Three Party Conventions) Harry W. Laidler Page	106
AMERICAN WAR PRISONERS John Nevin Sayre Page	81	SOUTH AMERICAN NOTES Marion G. Eaton Page	114
EDITORIAL NOTES What Is a Blockade? E. C. . Page	85	AN AMERICAN LABOR PARTY W. Harris Crook Page	118
Elections in Europe. H.W.L. Page	86	THE INTERNATIONAL LA- BOR CONFERENCES Caro Lloyd Page	122
Coal Dust. W. H. C. Page	88	SOCIALIST REVIEW CALEN- DAR Page	124
A TALK WITH TOM MANN Walter G. Fuller Page	91	COLLEGE NOTES Jessica Smith Page	127
THE STEEL STRIKE AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS "E. N." Page	93		

Our Contributors

- | | |
|---|--|
| EVANS CLARK. Former instructor of gov-
ernment in Princeton and director of the
Information Department of the Russian
Soviet Bureau. | CARO LLOYD. Author of the "Life of
Henry Demarest Lloyd." |
| W. HARRIS CROOK. Managing editor of
<i>The Socialist Review</i> , formerly editor of
the <i>Boston Forward</i> . | LOUIS P. LOCHNER. Business manager
of the Federated Press. |
| B. N. LANGDON-DAVIES, M. A. Mem-
ber of the Independent Labor Party of
Great Britain and a lecturer on Inter-
national subjects. | "E. N." A social investigator. |
| MARION G. EATON. Member of the Re-
search Department of an international
finance corporation. | G. N. Lecturer on social and international
problems, closely associated with the
Fuel Administration during the war. |
| WALTER G. FULLER. Assistant editor of
<i>The World Tomorrow</i> . | HENRY NEUMANN, Ph.D. The leader
of the Brooklyn Ethical Culture Society. |
| JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN, Ph.D.
Author of "American Socialism of the
Present Day," "Facts of Socialism." | JAMES ONEAL. Member of the Executive
Committee of the Socialist Party, edi-
torial writer on the <i>New York Call</i> , and
author of "The History of the Working
Class in America." |
| HARRY W. LAIDLER, Ph.D. Editor of
<i>The Socialist Review</i> , author of "Boy-
cotts and the Labor Struggle" and other
books. | JOHN NEVIN SAYRE. Member of the
Executive Committee of the Civil Lib-
erties Bureau. |
| | JESSICA SMITH. Executive Secretary of
the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. |

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Vol. VIII.

JANUARY 1920

No. 2

To George Bernard Shaw

Jessie Wallace Hughan

The word of God came unto one who sat
Among the scorers; and his eyes were touched
With light, and there was laid upon his lips
A coal of living fire. But still he cried,—
“Depart from me! I am a sinful man,
My lot it is to toss the glittering balls
Amid the puzzled plaudits of the crowd,
And not to kneel among thy simple saints.
Take back thy gift!” But ever as he walked
From out his lips there rose a holy flame
That kindled all the place whereon it fell
With a consuming fire—and from the ground
He gathered dust and ashes in his hands,
Casting them on the flame in eddying whirl
And playful spirals; while the people cheered,
“This is the maddest, merriest one of all!”

* * * * *

But who can quench the spirit of the Lord?

The Case for Political Action

James Oneal

Even before the close of the world war the old questionings regarding the efficacy of political action were being heard in the socialist parties of the world. The Russian revolution and the end of the war have accelerated discussion and in this country controversy over this question has resulted in a "split" in the Socialist Party. No matter how the various countries may differ in economic development or in historical tendencies, there are those in all countries who call themselves socialists who either demand the abandonment of political action or who insist on a policy which means its practical repudiation.

Extremes Meet

The struggle is not a new one. It is as old as the struggle between Marx and Bakounin in the 'sixties, and much that is now said against political action is a paraphrase of the arguments of the anti-socialists of early days. It is also remarkable how extremes meet on this question. Those who oppose political action or relegate it to an insignificant position, emphasize economic action in its various forms as a substitute for the political struggle. Mr. Gompers has glorified this policy for a generation, and the only difference between his advocacy and that of the insurgents in the socialist movement is that he presented it in the name of a conservative unionism and the insurgents present it in the name of a "revolu-

tionary" unionism. Yet at the moment when the insurgents have become enthusiastic over this policy, Mr. Gompers stands aghast at its results, while his rank and file proceed to Chicago to organize for political action!

One thing can be said of the urge back of these changes. The ranks of the American Federation of Labor are acting in response to their actual experience. The socialist insurgents are acting in response to their emotions, which in turn are a reaction from the war and from the Russian revolution. Mr. Gompers' bankrupt policy is likely to become the exclusive property of these insurgents who are offering it in the name of genuine socialism.

Socialists and Industrial Action

Here it may be said that our critics have not always been honest in their criticism of the socialist view of political action. They have ascribed to it a mere desire to participate in political campaigns to secure public office. The history of the party does not justify this distorted view. I believe that, if the figures were available, it could be shown that the party has raised more funds for workers involved in strikes than it has for its campaigns. It is also certain that more of the time of the party membership is taken up in assisting these struggles than in political campaigns. The economic struggle has always

been accepted as of equal importance with the struggle to secure public power.

The revival of the old questionings has its origin in the war and the Russian revolution. During the war many socialists rushed to the support of their imperialists, and their action shattered the International. Their conduct has led the insurgents to despair of political action. But if socialists became chauvinist apologists for the imperialist powers, it is also true that many of those who rejected political action followed these socialists in supporting their governments. Syndicalists, half-brothers of the insurgents, were equally guilty with the deserting socialists. It would seem that the logical reaction to all the facts would have been a cynical pessimism regarding the whole working class movement and a complete retirement from the struggle.

Reflex of Russian Revolution

The part which Russia contributed to the insurgent struggle in our movement here was due to her revolution. As a result of the revolution there developed a faction here that regarded it as the essence of socialist orthodoxy for the movement in all countries to adopt the program of our Russian comrades. One faction did adopt this program almost in its entirety, and persistently attempted to make the adoption of the Russian program a criterion for judging all the socialist movements of the world. These zealots forgot that Lenin himself warned the Hungarian comrades not slavishly to follow the Russians,

but to formulate a program consistent with conditions in Hungary.

Causes of the Russian Revolution

At least six important factors account for the success of the Russian revolution:

1. The bureaucratic state which, even before the war, was lacking in efficiency and permeated with grafting scoundrels, a state affected with dry rot, a contrast to the smooth-working bourgeois state of the West.

2. The economic collapse of Russia, which rendered it difficult to supply the soldiers with food and materials at the front.

3. A food shortage that amounted almost to a famine, a famine probably more acute than that in any other country, which made an end of the war a vital necessity.

4. A weak and immature bourgeoisie which had not conquered the bureaucracy but which had cowered before it and accepted a subordinate rôle in Russian life. This bourgeoisie, small in numbers and weak in power, had not consolidated itself as a ruling class in the state. It was floundering about in uncertainty when the bolsheviks struck their blow.

5. The soldiers and sailors had been affected with revolutionary ideas for years before the war, many of them being involved in mutinies during the Russo-Japanese war. In the ten years that had elapsed since the previous revolutionary uprising, increasing numbers of soldiers and sailors had been reached with revolutionary propaganda. This with the known graft

in the army and navy and the imminence of famine made the soldiers and sailors ready for the signal to end the agony of slaughter.

6. The workers of the cities were overwhelmingly revolutionary and the peasants were susceptible to any party that pledged an end to the war and an opportunity to return to their villages and enjoy peace.

These are the chief factors which account for the success of the second revolution. Other factors, such as the evasion by the allies of Kerensky's constant appeal for them to revise their war aims, could be cited, but the six enumerated are the main factors involved.

Russian Conditions Not Duplicated Here

Is it necessary for one to point out that not one of these factors is to be found in the United States? No one would be foolish enough to compare the "democratic" State in this country with the old Russian State or contend that the former is as unstable as was the latter. There is certainly no imminent economic collapse in this country, no dislocation of transportation, no such breaking down of industry as was found in Russia. As for famine we were less affected by food problems during the war than was any other nation. A few minor restrictions on the production and sales of foodstuffs were imposed, but not enough to cause any marked discontent. As for our bourgeoisie, they are probably the most powerful and the most firmly entrenched group of capitalists in the world. The ruling

classes, it is but too apparent, are able to use the soldiers and sailors for the latters' undoing and to the detriment of the working class. There is no evidence of any great change in the psychology of the army and navy, at least any such change as would constitute a menace to capitalism. As for the masses in general, the war left them with a patriotic psychology, as is evidenced by the fact that they are now often found composing mobs ready to deport and lynch "agitators" and other "undesirable citizens."

If we turn our attention to the farmers, we will find that, in recent weeks, a number of farmers' organizations have paid their respects to the "agitators" and the "bolsheviks."

The capitalist regime in this country came out of the war an aggressive and insolent thing, bent on extending the militarist legislation of the war to the peace period. Their representatives have not been reprimanded and in many cases their actions have been approved. All the conditions which in Russia forced the masses into the streets of the villages and cities to take possession of public power are absent here, yet there are those who have urged the suicidal policy of following the policy of the Russian comrades.

There may come a crisis at some time in this and other countries that will bring capitalism up against an insoluble impasse. It is almost certain that such crises will occur this winter in Europe. In such cases it is not the socialists who determine the

policies of the moment. It is the onward sweep of the masses who are forced to rise by intolerable conditions. They sweep everything before them, including such leaders as are not capable of serving them in this hour of change. But in such periods of upheaval it is important also to know the real situation, not to overestimate it. A riot is not a revolution. A revolution must be the expression of the will of a majority of the great masses if it is to be successful. A minority fomenting a premature attack resolves itself into a riot and the "revolution" becomes an abortion.

An Aid to Reaction

Furthermore, repudiation of political action and insistence upon some vague "mass action" in a period when a patriotic psychology rages is deliberately to play into the hands of capitalist reaction. It is the opportunity and justification of the latter for striking down civil rights and for extending the bureaucratic war legislation of the war to the peace period. The insurgents serve to decorate the headlines of the capitalist press in accounts of brutal police raids and are either forced to go underground or to give up any idea of an organized effort to reach the minds of the masses.

The German Crisis

The situation in Germany is important in this discussion. Germany is certainly more favorable to social revolution than is the United States. It suffered in much the same way as did Russia, although not to the same

extent. There was a partial breakdown of the economic life, much suffering from lack of food, a rebellious working class, and mutiny in the army and navy. But the German State was more firmly set and more efficiently organized than was the Russian State. The German bourgeoisie was powerful, though it shared its power with the Junkers and militarists. The conditions in Germany were not quite so favorable for social revolution as in Russia, yet much more favorable than in the United States. In fact, there is no comparison between the United States and Germany in this respect. Yet up to the moment of writing this article, the revolutionary workers of Germany have returned to the attack time after time *à la Russe* and the bourgeois—"socialist" state has withstood every shock. If in Germany many thousands of sincere comrades have given their lives in trying without success to repeat the Russian drama, how account for the suicidal advice that only recently was being offered within the Socialist Party here?

It is one thing to be *driven* underground by the illegal and usurpatory actions of capitalist governments and to indulge in "mass action" and "extra-parliamentary" action. It is another thing deliberately to *choose* to go underground when the political field, political action and a political forum are open to you. To take the underground route as a matter of choice, or to adopt tactics that lead you to it, is to play into the hands of

the enemy. To hold on to the political forum and to use it to pillory the capitalist opposition for its betrayal of its own legal forms, is to choose a strategic advantage in the struggle that wins you sympathy and deprives the enemy of any moral advantage. In this situation the socialists have the advantage of defending the best historical traditions of the nation, while contending for a complete transformation of capitalism. The bourgeois opposition is shown to be the betrayer of the best ideals of its golden age. It is placed on the defensive. The socialist, instead of having to explain and apologize, can muster his forces to attack the bourgeois opposition.

If in spite of all the efforts of the socialists to preserve free forums, civilized discussion and political struggle, the opposition boldly repudiates its constitutional regime, resorts to the mailed fist and to a dictatorship of capitalist might, political action ceases,—not, however, because socialists choose to abandon it, but because the capitalist opposition has strangled it. In that event the bourgeois opposition drives troops of its former supporters to the movement, just as the czarist bureaucracy did in Russia. But so long as the political field is open, any repudiation of political action and any resort to “mass action” drives those who eventually will join with the socialists into the arms of the reactionary capitalist opposition, justifies reaction, and strengthens the exploiters in a policy of “crushing the internal enemy.”

The above contention is not mere theory. It is verified in the history of the socialist movement in all countries. The emotional zealots who are talking of “mass action” and are giving merely a nominal support to political action—just enough to indicate a practical repudiation of it—deliver themselves bound hand and foot to the opposition while making the socialist position in the class struggle still more trying and difficult.

Disadvantages of Political and Industrial Action

Political action has its disadvantages and its dangers, to be sure. Thrusting spokesmen of the workers into such an environment as a bourgeois legislative body brings temptations and risks for them. But the economic struggle also has its limitations, disadvantages and temptations. There are plenty of examples of the socialist giving his time to the economic organizations of labor and finally ending his career as an apologist of conservatism. The fact that both socialists and syndicalists supported their native imperialists in the world war is evidence of the fact that sole participation in the economic struggle is no more a guarantee against desertions or betrayals than is participation in the political struggle.

Our insurgents really betray a reversion to the old Puritan psychology in their fears of the political struggle. They fear contact with the “carnal things of this world,” they fear that they may be tainted by the struggle for labor emancipation. They will

never find any satisfactory adjustment for themselves in the capitalist regime. That would only come by deserting all phases of the struggle and by seeking a hermit's retreat of quiet and contentment.

Life for those consciously seeking a complete reorganization of capitalism on a socialist basis is one of adjusting the methods to the historical conditions in which they find themselves without sacrificing their ultimate aims. It is this adjustment the Socialist Party has made in this coun-

try since its organization and which it has made during the war. It has made mistakes of judgment because it is of human origin and composition. It will make more. But on the whole it has "muddled through" and has "carried on" despite its false friends and its open enemies. It has survived schisms within and attacks without and is likely to survive them all and serve as one agency, at least, in the emancipation of the working class from the intolerable exploitation and tyranny of the capitalist regime.

When the Devil Was Sick

B. N. Langdon-Davies

The capitalistic governments of a number of countries were in 1914 and for some few years afterwards in sore straits. There appeared to be a very grave danger of their age-long policy of competition and antagonism recoiling upon their own heads. Imperialism had been preached by British and other statesmen as a great ideal and the "big business" men had accepted it with enthusiasm. Unfortunately you cannot keep ideals to yourself and German statesmen had preached the same ideal with even greater thoroughness, while their business men had adopted it with a relentless logic all their own. The inevitable clash came, and in their sore straits the capitalistic governments turned to the common people and begged, cajoled, bullied, and, finally, compelled them to come to their aid.

And the common people, believing for the most part that their existence was at stake, obeyed. But they did not obey in such countries as America and Great Britain in the same way as in those lands whose peoples' spirit had been dulled and whose moral fibre had been relaxed by conscription. They consented, it is true, to the loss of hard-won civil and industrial rights; freedom of speech and action, freedom to refuse labor, freedom, indeed, of moral choice they allowed to be taken from them. But in one way or in another they assured themselves, in Great Britain at least, by obtaining at every step pledges from the capitalistic governments, of full and generous restoration when the hour of danger was past. And these pledges the British Government was ready enough to

give. Conscription, the Defense of the Realm Act, the Munitions Acts and half a dozen others were all declared emergency laws and undertakings were given that they would be purely temporary, and used solely for the purposes of the war. Anyone who hinted at the danger of their becoming permanent was branded as a traitor and a pro-German. The statesmen, no doubt, in their hour of panic meant every word they said. Asquith and Lloyd George were Liberals, Wilson was a Democrat. Perish the thought that their instincts were not all for freedom and that their words were not as good as their bonds!

Suppression and Politics

But as the war went on, it began to appear to an increasing number of common people that these Bayards could not, even though they would, keep the pledges they made by the way. In Britain, for example, the censorship and other restrictions upon freedom of speech came to be used not only for the prevention of information of military value reaching the enemy, but also, against all pledges, for the suppression of opinions in regard to the policy of the war. Then, by easy stages, it became the instrument by which all political opinion seriously distasteful to the government was silenced. In Great Britain again, and I prefer in general to draw my examples from my own country and to leave parallels for Americans themselves to supply, the power to intern enemy aliens was so far extended that the Executive could and

did seize and imprison without trial not only enemy aliens but also friendly and neutral aliens and even British citizens.

But an even greater number of the common people began to see that evil men were trading upon the simplicity of our good premiers and presidents to reap material advantage for themselves out of the extra freedom they gained from the curtailment of the freedom of others. Profiteering, not so new a vice by the way, as is very commonly supposed, appeared clearly in our midst and was not popular when industrialists had foregone their weapons of defence. Politicians were found to be using the vast ramifications of the cable, postal and press censorship for party purposes while the "big business" men entrusted with powers for the purpose of reconstruction prepared extensive schemes for their own future enrichment.

By the time the war ended a very large number of the common people, particularly those who were educated by being organized into trade unions or political groups, had begun to mistrust all pledges made by statesmen or employers. In Great Britain and in most of the Allied countries organized labor had made definite plans to fight politically and industrially not merely for the restoration of its elementary rights, but also for considerable changes in the social and economic order. Meanwhile the capitalist statesmen and the captains of industry had made up their minds that what they had they would do their

very best to hold and that the future advantages the license of war time had enabled them to plan should not be foregone. The coalition of political parties for the purpose of fighting Germany was without difficulty maintained for the purpose of fighting labor, as was also the suspension of that cut-throat competition in business which, by the way, we had always been assured was the sole guarantee of human progress. Liberals and conservatives are today indistinguishable in the legislature while in their aspect of employers they unite in federations and seek the arbitrament and patronage of their governments.

Control of the Government

Thus we have a new alignment in political life. We have society divided into capitalist and socialist and there is no other real issue. The capitalist, however, has the advantage of being in the saddle. He controls the government, the weapons, the bribes and most of the education; he can appeal to qualities, the merits of which have become complexes in men's minds, such as loyalty, respect for tradition and patriotism; and, finally, he has at the outset those powers which were lent him by his present opponents when he was sick and which he shows no signs of relinquishing now that those very opponents have cured him of his sickness.

Those powers are the right to decide what men shall think and say and do and to enforce the decisions by fines, imprisonments, deportations and, in some cases, violent intima-

tion, assault and murder. Six years ago we should never have believed that both America and Great Britain would today be hunting aliens from their shores and passing measures to prevent others from landing upon them. Six years ago who would have questioned the right of collective bargaining, who would have advocated the penalization of political opinion as a crime, who would have welcomed the continuance of conscription in free Britain? Yet today we have not only this, but an insistent demand that the penalties shall be more savage, the persecution more ruthless. Conscientious objectors are in prison and gunmen intimidate strikers in America; Britain represses with machine guns and bombs Indians, Egyptians and Irishmen; the police in both countries search, seize, arrest and imprison at the order of the Executive.

How, it may be asked, is a public which must by now be alive to the situation, induced to accept such a situation? By what process are those divisions maintained through which some of the common people can be induced to oppress others at the bidding of their common opponents? By what fictions can democratic approval be claimed for laws and policies which the majority of the people undoubtedly disapprove? The answer, in Britain at least, is not far to seek. The old party machines are in the hands of the capitalist employers. The parties having united their forces, all who oppose them are easily branded as traitors to their country.

Thus every political and, still more, every industrial move made by labor today is declared to be not merely an attack on the administration, which it is, but also an attack on the nation as a whole. The police are public servants; therefore a new Act has been passed prohibiting them from striking or even organizing themselves into a union.

Electricity, water and gas are public necessities; special laws and regulations exist or are promulgated to limit the freedom of the operatives in these industries. But coal, transport, food and by an easy transition all the main industries can be brought into the same category. Thus industrially labor can be paralyzed in its fight by similar arguments to those used in wartime. Politically it is not quite so easy, but the capitalists can renew their imperialism and can even pretend that the country is in danger from the Russians or some such people and thus can make opposition to the particular administration appear to be treason to the state. In the last resort, of course, they can pit America and Great Britain against one another in order to checkmate the political labor movement in both countries and for this course they are apparently at this moment making all their preparations.

When it comes to the actual making of laws there is at present but little difficulty. The mood of many American congressmen and senators, representing as they do nothing but capitalist interests, is entirely in favor of repression and intimidation.

In this they are manfully supported by the press and the judiciary. In Great Britain their task is not quite so easy, since there is a Labor Party in the House of Commons and the *Daily Herald* has swept into a circulation of first class magnitude. However, a very large majority of members, but few of whom will ever be elected again, can be relied on to vote for Mr. Lloyd George, whatever he does.

The Passage of Laws

As to the continued pretence that these laws are the will of the democracy one example alone of the way in which they are promulgated will suffice to show how hollow it is. At the very end of our last Parliamentary Session a bill was introduced to renew for varying periods nineteen acts and eighty-seven regulations which had been introduced as emergency measures during the war. These measures struck at the very roots of freedom, but, since they were referred to only under their formal titles the members of the House of Commons for the most part found them perfectly innocuous since, without weeks of study, they could not possibly know anything about them. Other devices successfully or unsuccessfully adopted are, for instance, the attempt by Mr. Churchill to introduce into the Army Annual Bill regulations taken from the Defense of the Realm Act on the subject of speeches with a tendency to hinder recruiting and the retention under military orders as a condition of release from the

colors all the men in the army during the war.

The Secret Police

Meanwhile the secret police system, national and international, is being developed on lines excelling even those of the Czarist regime in Russia. We have all sorts of secret agents following the movements of those who are feared or suspected by any one capitalist government. Men who have been given foreign office passports which have been duly viséd, find themselves dogged and even prevented from traveling by Military Intelligence agents. Indeed there is a whole department in Great Britain devoted to placing spies in the industrial world and to following up any or all whom the government dislikes.

One further example from Great Britain and I have done. The Military Service Acts were passed between 1916 and 1918 for the duration of the war. Hostilities ceased on November 11, 1918. On November 21, by the Duration of the War Act, conscription was left in force until, "as nearly as may be," the ratification of peace. On January 27, 1919, the War Office announced the continuance of conscription in any case throughout the year, while, on February 19th, Mr. Churchill bettered this by declaring that its continuance depended on the payment of the indemnity by our late enemies and the yield of volunteers. At this moment it has been extended until next April and no man, except when physically unfit, has been finally discharged from the Army.

These are but a few examples of how the weapons used against the Central Powers are today being prepared for use against labor. In Great Britain the defence and simultaneously the attack against these things is being maintained in the press, in Parliament, and, in the last resort, in the workshop. In America, the forces seem to be less organized and the struggle in consequence more bitter. Regarding it as hopeless to fight politically, labor has turned to the industrial weapon and the capitalist is retaliating with ruthless ferocity. Perhaps the hope of the future lies in the American Labor Party recently launched at Chicago. In any case, violent repression can only be succeeded by violent revolution. For a revolution in the sense of a vital change in the economic and political organization of society must come in every civilized country and must come soon. The continued attempts on the part of capitalist administrations to put back the hands of the clock bode anything but good. It is time for those of the workers who can guide the march of events to assume the political power and to save the peoples from a generation of agony.

Readers!

If you change your postal address let us know immediately. We cannot otherwise be responsible for the correct mailing of your copy of the **SOCIALIST REVIEW**.

American Imperialism

Henry Neumann

American lads are likely to be called upon now at any time to lay down their lives in Mexico. The situation is no surprise to those who have followed the history of America's two decades as a world-power.

For light upon that history it would pay us to see ourselves for a moment in the eyes of our Latin-American neighbors. Ask these people what they think of the "Yankee Peril." They will point to America's ownership of the Philippines, Panama, Porto Rico, the Danish West Indies, and our politico-financial protectorates over Santo-Domingo, Haiti, Nicaragua, Honduras—all acquired in the last twenty years. In Costa Rica, the government established three years ago has not yet been recognized by President Wilson, and the conditions are quite ripe for making that country an early annex to our list of "responsibilities."

When our officials protest that our only object is to maintain law and order, Latin-Americans smile; for they recall the orderly circumstances under which the Panama Canal Zone came into our possession. "I took the Zone," said Mr. Roosevelt. In the brief space of only four days after Panama had seceded from Colombia, our government recognized the new republic. Our troops prevented the mother country from winning it back. Mr. James Du Bois, United States minister to Colombia at the time, says that "the Colombians woke that morn-

ing in 1903, to find their most important province wrested from them by a baker's dozen of conspirators, aided by the armed forces of (American) battle cruisers; and this baker's dozen of rebels were mostly men *interested directly or indirectly in the \$40,000,000 French syndicate*. Without a moment's warning and while *trusting firmly in our treaty engagements*, the Colombians found their guaranteed boundary lines hurled back hundreds of miles from the railroad, their richest asset lost forever, their credit destroyed, their pride of sovereignty humiliated."¹ General Goethals told President Roosevelt that the order to build the canal had been pronounced out of accord with the law. The reply was: "Damn the law! I want the canal built." (*Times*, Jan. 14, 1917).

Our Control of Santo Domingo and Haiti

Much indeed can be accomplished by "executive orders." Witness the present rule of the American navy over the former republic of Santo Domingo. In 1904, an American corporation filed certain claims against the Santo-Domingo government. It was awarded a lien upon the customs

¹*Evening Post*, March 20, 1917. (Italics ours.) See also Freehof, *America and the Canal Title* (Sully and Kleinteich, pub.); *The World Peril*; chap. America's Interest in the War, by Members of the Faculty of Princeton University (Princeton Univ. Press), p. 121ff; also 136ff.

receipts. Other claims were at once pressed by other creditors, so that in 1905, the United States stepped in as a sort of receiver. Evidently this was not enough. In 1916, American warships took possession and set up a military dictatorship — with all that the phrase implies—which is still there. The land is ruled by an American naval captain.

The republic of Haiti had a congress of its own until September, 1917, when American marines disbanded the congress and put an end to a republic which had lasted for one hundred and thirteen years. There were disturbances in Haiti, and it was impossible to earn the usual dividends. The Haitian government was forced to turn its customs house over to our control, and its National Bank was transferred to the National City Bank of New York. The revenues of Haiti go first to paying the expenses of the receivership, next of course to paying the debts of foreign investors and last of all to the native government.

Mark the skill with which America has learned her lesson in these ventures from the experiences of Great Britain. "The most important innovation (in Haiti)," says a frank defender of our imperialistic enterprises,¹ "is the establishment of a native constabulary *under American* officers for the maintenance of order. Experience has abundantly proved that such a constabulary can be made absolutely loyal to the dominant race. It rapidly acquires a prestige and

caste character of which it is immensely proud, and which makes any collusion with its own race *for purposes subversive of the established order*, altogether unlikely."

Porto Rico

Porto Rico came into our possession in the Spanish American war. Much to our credit has been done for the natives in the way of schooling and sanitation. Nevertheless they are not contented. In 1916, Congress passed a law granting Porto Rico its own legislature; but in this body the senate is composed of men who own at least a thousand dollar's worth of property even though they may have been residents of the island *for only two years*. The general franchise has been restricted by a series of property and educational qualifications which have resulted in actually disfranchising sixty per cent. of those who had voted previously.

The *New Republic* (June 3, 1916) commented on this law as follows: "Porto Rico is composed principally of large sugar and tobacco plantations in the hands of a small class. Out of the 1,200,000 inhabitants, 600,000 are agricultural laborers and 25,000 are industrial workers. There are comparatively few small proprietors *and they are becoming fewer every day*. The laborers will have no voice in the making of the laws; they are to all intents and purposes attached to the land; and they are protected only by a general bill of rights and the courts, which will operate in the costly American fashion. The United States by

¹H. H. Powers, *America Among the Nations*, p. 130.

the new law therefore establishes a *capitalistic feudalism which may easily be usurped by settlers from this country*. Since the laborers, both men and women, work *twelve hours for wages averaging thirty to fifty-five cents a day*, it is not likely that they will soon overcome the property qualification for the vote. It will take a generation at least for them to meet the educational requirements. In the meantime, what hope is there for improvement through union organization, with all the political and police power in the hands of their employers?" (Italics ours).

Who is it in the last resort who decides that these things shall happen? As citizens we have a vote upon these matters—more or less directly—but in the present state of public opinion, how many voters are either acquainted with the facts or care to get them? Here is the great chance for those who have their own axes to grind and who know how to go about the job of getting the government to do the grinding.

Commerce and the Philippines

Our experience in the Philippines is a typical instance. An examination of the documents, says Maximo M. Kalaw in "The Case for the Filipinos," shows that when the islands came into our possession in May, 1898, nobody seemed to know in the least what was to be done with them. The official utterances reflected a state of marked uncertainty. An article by Mr. Frank Vanderlip in the *Century* for August, showed, however, that men of his type were already at

work to dispel that uncertainty. The article spoke in glowing terms of the alluring prospects in these entrances to trade with China, Korea, Indo-China, etc., and of the opportunities for "great development companies." These views, typical of the opinions of a class not without influence in our public affairs, did their part to help us make up our minds. In which direction? On August 12, Admiral Dewey received from the Secretary of the Navy a cable requesting information about the islands, "the character of their population; coal and other mineral deposits; their harbor and commercial advantages; and in a naval and commercial sense, which would be most advantageous."¹

While the Senate was debating, the Filipinos rose against the continued occupation of their land by those who had come to help them win their liberty from Spain. Mr. Kalaw gives a significant account of the propaganda which was at once begun to discredit these people in the eyes of the American public. One of the worst offenders was Dean C. Worcester, head of the Visayan Refining Company in the Philippines, who played up the barbarism of a tiny portion of the inhabitants and kept in the background the fact that over ninety per cent. of the Filipinos were Christians.

The future policy of America with regard to the islands is uncertain. Judge Gary was quoted in *The Times*, April 18, 1919, as telling the Merchants' Association that we

¹Kalaw, *Case for the Filipinos*, p. 26.

should stay in control. On the other hand there are those who hold that it would be an advantage to withdraw. Mr. Vanderlip's sanguine expectations have not been fulfilled. Profits to American commerce have been in the neighborhood of only two million dollars a year. It is chiefly the small American business men, according to Mr. Kalaw, who have gained from American occupation. Col. Roosevelt in 1915 declared the islands a weakness from a military standpoint; and in the debate on the Jones bill in 1914, to increase the measure of self-government granted to the Filipinos, Representative Mann said that he wanted to see these people happy and friendly so that we could count on their help in the coming war in Asia. Freedom in the near future has been promised; but of this much we may be certain: howsoever the fate of the islands is settled, considerations of moral right and wrong will not be the only influences in the decision.

Loanable Capital and Imperialism

The present time is peculiarly opportune for further ventures in American imperialism. Listen to the *Evening Mail*, April 7, 1917: "When this war is over, we shall face the future with our industrial productive capacity doubled, our stores of loanable capital multiplied ten-fold over their pre-war proportions . . . (Our allies) and we will engage in a desperate struggle for the markets of the undeveloped non-industrial world, Central and South America and China before all other lands. Every nation's accumulations of capital will seek

these same fields . . . Interests clash. We must be armed and strong for the future, even if the Entente wins the war." (Italics ours).

Both predictions have been verified. Disarmament has been rejected. Big business and high finance have had their appetites whetted. In 1913, President Wilson refused to sanction the participation of American bankers in a loan to China on the ground that "the responsibility implied might conceivably go to the length in some unhappy contingency of forcible interference in the financial and even the political affairs of that great Oriental state." But in this matter as in others, the decisions of President Wilson have proved not quite so inflexible as they sounded. In November, 1917, without consulting the wishes of the Chinese people in the least, America and Japan entered into the Lansing-Ishii agreement to respect one another's "special interests" in China. The next step was the "consortium" of 1919, in which American bankers were permitted to take the step forbidden in 1913. The matter was announced in the *New York World*, May 13, 1919, as follows: "A new consortium has been arranged for the control of loans to China. . . . The matter will be handled by American, French, British and Japanese bankers backed by their governments. . . . It was stated officially . . . that the United States would protect all the interests secured in good faith." (Italics ours).

Another significant item appears in the same report: "An arrangement

has been made whereby the Siberian railroad will be put into condition by these four powers and Italy, a temporary loan of \$20,000,000 to be advanced at once. . . . Negotiations had been under way in this and Allied countries; but the bankers thought the Omsk Government should first be recognized by the Allies and the United States in order to furnish a guarantee." When President Wilson was asked by the Senate in July, 1919, why American troops were in Siberia, he replied that they were needed to protect the Siberian railroad.

The Spirit of Militarism

Is there any connection between the foregoing facts and these further facts? Secretary Baker has asked for a conscript army of 500,000 men. Secretary Daniels has objected that Congress' appropriation of \$25,000,000 for an increased airplane service is pitiful compared with Great Britain's appropriation. For the coming year, Congress has voted \$4,000,000 for military drill in high schools and colleges (and only \$524,000 for general education). Who are the ones most interested in measures of this kind? The New York *Times* of May 16, 1916, tells us: "The National Security League issued a statement yesterday in which it was shown that the states whose representatives voted for the Chamberlain army bill are those which bear the heaviest tax burdens, while those whose representatives aided in defeating the provisions of the Senate bill are those whose contributions to the support of the National Government are less." Then come

figures indicating the commercial importance of the different states. The list is headed by New York, "whose entire delegation, with the exception of one Socialist, voted for the larger army."

Millions of our fellow citizens as yet have not the remotest idea that there is any connection between the interests of capitalistic imperialism and militarism. Our senate cannot be charged with ignorance on this head. In 1916, Senator La Follette introduced an amendment to the Naval Appropriation bill that no warship was to be used to "compel the collection of any pecuniary claim of any kind or to enforce the right to any grant . . . on behalf of any citizen, co-partnership, or corporation of the United States." The amendment was defeated by a vote of forty-two to eight.

How many more wars will it take to open our eyes?

Student Readers

All students who desire at one and the same time to help increase THE SOCIALIST REVIEW circulation, and increase their own incomes are asked to write to the Managing Editor for information concerning subscription rates and sales at meetings. Students of any American college or university who also belong to their Intercollegiate Socialist Society College Chapter can have THE SOCIALIST REVIEW mailed to their college address for nine months at the special rate of \$1.00, or for the full twelve months for \$1.40.

American War Prisoners

John Nevin Sayre

Several thousand Americans made prisoners by their fellow countrymen in the name of democracy's war are today held in federal prisons under conditions of confinement and persecution which are in glaring contrast to all for which democracy stands. Although not a single enemy soldier was able to invade the soil of the United States, and although a year has now passed since the signing of the armistice and the crushing of the German army and navy, yet the American Government has shown little mercy toward those citizens whom it has imprisoned on charges of obstructing the war. Many of these people have been treated with a ruthlessness almost beyond belief, the treatment in some cases resulting in death. The facts have been reported to Washington, but still the Government fails to remedy conditions in any decisive manner.

And for months it was next to impossible to make known the truth to the public. What is the truth about the present status of American war-prisoners in the United States?

Roughly these prisoners may be divided into three classes: (1) court martialled soldiers, (2) conscientious objectors and (3) alleged violators of the Espionage and Selective Service Acts. These may be designated "war-prisoners," since all of them are in prison for offences connected with

the war laws or the army discipline. They are not in prison for violation of the ordinary civil law of the land.

I. Court-Martialled Soldiers.

At Fort Leavenworth, in July, 1919, some 2,200 men were imprisoned in the United States Disciplinary Barracks. Most of these men were soldiers undergoing punishment for the infraction of military rules. Many of them were discouraged under court-martial sentences of a severity altogether out of proportion to the seriousness of the offense committed. In some cases the sentence of imprisonment ran for 20 and more years. About 1,000 of the prisoners had lately returned from service in France, where they had risked their lives for their country. In the prison at this time there were perhaps not more than 20 conscientious objectors. Practically the whole of the prison population thus consisted of American army boys. Eight months had passed since the signing of the armistice which had terminated the fighting. Some of the European governments had already granted amnesty to their soldier offenders, and others were seriously considering the problem.¹ The

¹Italy, Germany and the governments of Central Europe pardoned their political prisoners soon after the armistice was signed. In England a petition for amnesty had been presented to Parliament during the spring

American boys felt that it was time for our Government to show a little generosity to them. Out of the discontent engendered by these and other circumstances, a prisoners' strike occurred.

One morning a majority of the men refused to go to work. Several hundred others not joining the strike were returned from the workshop by the prison authorities to the wings where their cells were located and were thus forced to lose their identity in the general mass of striking prisoners. During the entire strike, the prisoners threatened no violence and made no show of resistance to the prison guards. Yet the military command chose to call this strike a mutiny, and visited the following punishments indiscriminately upon 2,200 men, strikers and non-strikers alike: (1) reduction of food for five days to bread and water; (2) abolition of the prisoner's grievance committee, the honor system and home parole and barrack-parole privileges; (3) cancellation of the shortening of sentences which had been earned by individuals for good conduct; (4) abolition of entertainment and recreation privileges; (5) enforcement of the rule of silence prohibiting all conversation at meals and work; (6) increase of hours of work so as to ex-

signed by 83 members of Parliament, 17 bishops, and a large number of distinguished men, including Viscount Bryce, Viscount Morley, Sir John Simon, Mr. Arthur Henderson, Professor Gilbert Murray, Mr. H. G. Wells, Mr. G. B. Shaw, Mr. G. K. Chesterton, Mr. Arnold Bennett and others.

clude a rest day on Sunday and to compel workers in the power plant to toil for twelve instead of eight-hour shifts. Most drastic of all, on one of the days when the strike was in progress, *two army officers discharged their revolvers through the prison windows, taking pot-shots at the defenceless men within.* One fellow was killed and several were injured.¹

II. Conscientious Objectors

Let us turn now to the cases of conscientious objectors, of whom there are more than 150 still in confinement, men who, in obedience to conscience, have felt it necessary to protest against the method of war, by refusing to be conscripted into the military machine. At the United States Disciplinary Barracks at Alcatraz Island in San Francisco Bay, four religious objectors—three Hofer brothers and Jacob Wipf—were confined in a dark dungeon, with damp walls, insufficient food and blankets. At the end of five days they were removed by the recommendation of the medical examiner and placed in isolation. Later they were transferred to Fort Leavenworth and placed in solitary confinement. Within ten days two of the Hofer brothers died of pneumonia. The body of one of these men was sent home dressed in a U. S. army uniform, although he had laid down his life in prison rather than wear military clothing.

¹The above facts were contained in a letter from one of the inmates whom I believe to be reliable, and many of whose statements were corroborated by other evidence.

The Rev. Robert Whitaker of Los Gatos, California, after a personal investigation of Alcatraz prison, writes on September 19, 1919:

"The conditions with respect to solitary imprisonment are such as the public would not tolerate if they really understood the facts . . . the solitary cells are only about five feet wide, approximately eight feet long and eight feet high . . . there is no ventilation worthy of mention, and even during the brief period when the prisoners are taken out, the cells themselves are kept closed frequently, so that they get no fresh air. The men are compelled to sleep on the cement floor with only a blanket between them and the floor. Men are kept in solitary for 14 days at a time and given only bread and water during this period. They are taken out of solitary and forced out of doors where they are exposed to the rigorous winds on the windward side of the island for eight hours a day. Then they are thrust back into solitary again for 14 days and the whole process repeated over and over again. One of the men with whom I talked had in this manner put in 48 days in solitary. If the object of this treatment is to break down their sanity and increase the number of insane people in California, it is admirably adapted to it."

Utterly unfair is the system at present in vogue at Alcatraz by which men are being tried and sentenced two or more times for what is essentially but one offense. Mr. Whitaker writes:

"These men have been tried for refusing military service. They have been sentenced to various periods of imprisonment, two and three and five years or more. It is an axiom of law that a man cannot be tried more than once for the same offense. Yet at Alcatraz all of these men are being tried over and over again and their terms indefinitely extended for what constitutes practically the original offense. They have taken their stand on a matter of conscience and had accepted sen-

tences for the same, but after a few days they are given orders, which, if they obey, nullify their original stand. Thereafter if they refuse to obey, then they are dragged before a court martial and another six months or a year or even five years is added to their term. The present trick seems to be to bring them before a court martial every four weeks, and to practically insure for them life imprisonment, although the courts had no such intention."

This sort of treatment be it noted is not brutal hazing by one or two subordinate officers. It is the systematic policy of the administrators of Alcatraz prison. It is something which the War Department could stop, and it seems inexcusable that the department continues to allow these atrocities.

However wrong these prisoners may seem to be, the moral courage, the fidelity to conviction, and the capacity for sacrificial suffering shown by many of them surely deserve at least intelligent and considerate treatment rather than the imprisonment and torture which many have received.

III. Political Heretics.

Under this heading I group the civilians indicted or taken into custody by the Government for alleged violation of the Espionage and Draft Acts. The exact number of these persons is difficult to obtain, but there are safe grounds for stating that it is considerably over 1,000.¹ *None of*

¹The report of the Attorney General for the year 1918 shows that, up to June 30th of that year, there had been convictions in 363 cases and that 496 cases were still pending at that time. In many of these cases more than

this group was convicted for plotting with Germans, accepting German money or acting as an agent of foreign governments. The political heretics whose cases we are here discussing are American citizens. They have not, except in comparatively few cases, sought by overt acts to obstruct recruiting, the sale of Liberty bonds, or other machinery directly related to the carrying on of war. Most of them have not directly counselled others to violate existing laws.

The press clippings on file at the National Civil Liberties Bureau indicate that convictions in two-thirds of these cases were based on reports of private conversations. Private opinions expressed in personal family letters have in at least one instance been the chief evidence for conviction. In other cases, membership in an organization such as the I. W. W. has been sufficient to secure conviction, even though the convicted members were not shown to have been personally responsible for the alleged illegal statements of the organization.

Fundamentally the crime of most of this group of political prisoners was that of giving expression either to opinions unpopular in war time or to sentiments obnoxious to those favoring the maintenance of the present economic order. In the vast majority of cases no proof was brought out that the voicing of these opinions constituted any "clear and present dan-

one person was involved. Since the date of the Attorney General's report, 144 defendants have been convicted in two cases alone. The Act has been enforced with increased vigor.

ger" to the cause of the United States, or that they had led others to commit unlawful acts. Proof merely that such statements might possibly so influence others was generally held sufficient ground for conviction and prison sentence.

In some cases, prison conditions for political prisoners are fairly good. In others prisoners are kept in semi-dark, vermin-infested cells which are a grave menace to health and sanity.¹

During the war the Government, pressed on all sides by difficult problems, might have been partially justified in failing to give proper attention to these conditions. Such justification, however, no longer exists. Besides, many of the injustices described above took place after November 11, 1918. The President is in a position to remedy these conditions within a day by the signing of a general amnesty. After that, it would be possible to overhaul the entire system of prison administration. How much longer shall we allow these conditions to continue to exist?

¹For a description of conditions in some of the Kansas prisons the reader is referred to Winthrop D. Lane's article on "Uncle Sam—Jailer" in *The Survey* of Sept. 6, 1919. Mr. Lane tells of one case of a disease-ridden and probably insane man who was confined in a small "tank" with 12 others, to the danger of all concerned. The Sedgwick County Jail is described by Mr. Lane as "the worst place for incarcerating human beings I have ever been in . . . it is filthy with the accumulated filth of decades . . . rats issue through crevices in the steel flooring. It is not uncommon for a prisoner to be awakened by a rat running over his bed or even across his face."

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Published Monthly by the

INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Room 914, Educational Building, 70 Fifth Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

Editor, HARRY W. LAIDLER. Wesleyan.

Managing Editor, W. HARRIS CROOK. Oxford.

Editorial Board

JAMES W. ALEXANDER.....	Princeton
EMILY G. BALCH.....	Bryn Mawr
EVANS CLARK	Amherst
H. W. L. DANA.....	Harvard
FELIX GRENDA.....	Columbia
JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN.....	Barnard
WINTHROP D. LANE.....	Michigan
F. F. ROCKWELL.....	Wesleyan
ALEXANDER TRACHTENBERG	Trinity

Contributing Editors

Louis B. Boudin, Stuart Chase, Arthur Gleason, Freda Kirchwey, John Haynes Holmes, Florence Kelley, Bruno Lasker, Caro Lloyd, James H. Maurer, Wm. P. Montague, S. Nuorteva, James Oneal, Harry A. Overstreet, Vida D. Scudder, Charles P. Steinmetz, Norman M. Thomas, Louis Untermeyer, and Sidney Zimand.

What Is a Blockade?

Representatives of the United States, both in Paris and Washington, have taken great pains to state that the United States Government has not joined with Great Britain and other allied nations in the blockade of Soviet Russia. They have taken upon themselves an air of virtuous superiority and have emphasized American traditions and the ideals of a free republic. The United States members of the Supreme Council refused to be a party to the recent allied note urging upon Germany and the neutral nations coöperation in maintaining the blockade.

The New York *Times* correspondent in a Paris dispatch of October 17, last, stated that "The American delegation said that America recognized no blockade except in time of war and could take no part in any physical blockade of the Bolsheviki." Assistant Secretary of State Phillips, in a recent official communication to Senator Wadsworth, stated that "so far as the United States is concerned no blockade exists."

These assertions raise the question when is a blockade not a blockade? The answer

is quite simple: when it is maintained by laws at home rather than by battleships abroad.

The United States Government is coöperating most effectively with Great Britain and France in their campaign of starvation against the people of Russia. At the same time it avoids not only the coal bills and sailor's wages for war vessels in the Baltic, but also the moral burden of committing piracy on the high seas.

The mechanism of this remarkable performance is, at the present time, simple, although not generally understood. Title VII of the Espionage Act gives the President power to restrict and limit in his discretion the export from the United States of any article or articles which he may by executive order specify. Section II of the Trading with the Enemy Act gives to the President the same authority and power over imports. Sec. 5 (b) gives him specific authority to control all transactions in foreign exchange, and the export of currency. In Executive order No. 2709 under date of October 17, 1917, President Wilson delegated this authority in respect to all articles "except coin, bullion or currency" to the War Trade Board, and specified a system of licenses which would be requisite for export and import trade. No goods can be shipped in or out of the country except by license from the War Trade Board. Similar jurisdiction over the movement of coin, bullion or currency was vested in the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board.

Both the War Trade and the Federal Reserve Boards, acting under directions from President Wilson, have consistently refused to issue any license to or from Soviet Russia. American manufacturers are as completely powerless to send their goods into Soviet Russia as if the entire U. S. fleet patrolled the Black Sea and the Baltic, and forcibly prevented their vessels from entering Petrograd or Novoryssisk.

One by one these restrictions have been lifted from countries with whom the United States has been at war. The restrictions

upon Soviet Russia with whom we are and have been at peace remain. On June 30, 1919 the Federal Reserve Board Bulletin announced that "... all restrictions have been removed from the export of coin, bullion and currency and from transactions in foreign exchange, except with or for persons in that part of Russia now under control of the so-called Bolshevik Government, including also the export and import of ruble notes." On July 20, the War Trade Board, now part of the Department of State, issued a ruling (WTBR 814) which authorized all persons to trade and communicate with persons residing in Germany, and to trade and communicate with all persons with whom trade and communication is forbidden by the Trading with the Enemy Act, "subject, however, to the following specific limitations and exceptions, to wit: . . . (2) The above mentioned

general license does not modify or affect in any respect present restrictions against trade and communication between the United States and Hungary or that portion of Russia under the control of the Bolshevik authorities."

The immediate interest in the present Russian policy of the United States lies in the fact that it will automatically break down the day that peace is concluded or that war-time legislation is repealed. The provisions of both the Espionage Law and the Trading with the Enemy Act as they affect exports and imports run only until peace is declared. As Secretary Phillips stated in his letter to Senator Wadsworth, "these measures cannot be continued after the ratification of peace unless there is new legislation."

It looks as if it would not be long before the United States Government would have to call a spade a spade. E. C.

Elections in Europe

The revolutions in Russia, Germany, Austria, and Hungary gave to the world striking evidence of the extent to which socialism had gained headway in these countries. Had socialism developed momentum during the war in other lands? This question has been persistently asked for many months past by friend and foe alike. In Italy, Belgium, and France it was answered at least in part by the November elections.

Most decisively was the reply given in Italy. The Italian Socialist Party in 1913 was represented by 59 members in the Chamber of Deputies. After the Reformists left the party, this number decreased to 29. During the war, the main body of the party membership took an extreme anti-war position and the party was regarded as one of the extreme left wing organizations of the world. Many of its leaders were arrested and socialist organs were suppressed.

After the Armistice the party fought against Italian imperialism, opposed the Allied block-

ade on Russia, agitated for amnesty for political prisoners, denounced the League of Nations, and worked in close coöperation with the trade unions in waging the many strikes which agitated Italy.

These issues were fought out during the campaign and when the vote was counted, it was found that the Socialist Party had more than doubled its representation, returning to the Chamber no less than 156 members out of a total of 508, or 30.7% of the total. The party thus became the largest single party of Italy. The Catholic Party sent some 90 deputies to the Chamber, while the Reformist Socialists, who supported the war, elected a small group of 16. Among the elected socialist deputies was Mr. Misiano, a former railway employe, who had been condemned to execution by court-martial after his desertion from the army.

On the appearance of the King in the Chamber at the convocation of Parliament, the socialist deputies shouted their "Long

Live Socialism" and left in a body. Their candidate for President of the Chamber, Deputy Lazzaria, received 143 votes, while the successful candidate, Orlando, obtained 251.

Premier Nitti of Italy explained the huge socialist vote as primarily an anti-war vote, not a vote for revolution. "The peoples of Europe," he declared, "will not have another war, and because the socialists form a party which always has opposed war, the people of Italy voted for them." He admitted, however, the growth in the belief in industrial democracy among the masses and the dominant position which the future would give to labor.

Included in the program of the parliamentary group is the immediate establishment of trade relations between Italy and Russia, and recognition of the Soviet Government, the taxation of wealth and distribution of land among the peasants, industrial democracy, with the workers choosing their own representatives to share in the direction of industrial organization, and immediate and complete demobilization.

In Belgium the first election under the "one man—one vote" suffrage placed the socialists of that country in the very front ranks of Belgian parties. Seventy socialists were elected to the Chamber of Deputies as compared with 40 prior to the war, while the popular vote leaped from 483,000 to 644,000, an increase of one-third despite the devastation of the war. The Catholic Party came second with 618,000 votes and the Liberals third with 309,000. The Catholics, although losing 26 seats, won 3 seats more than did the socialists.

Following the elections, the Socialist Party, which has taken a more distinctly conservative stand than have the Italian Socialists, decided to form a coalition cabinet with other groups.

According to reports from France, socialist hopes were completely dashed by the results of the French parliamentary elections. There is no denying the fact that the socialist loss in the Chamber of Deputies was great. Prior to the war 101 deputies repre-

sented the Unified Socialist Parties. In the November elections early reports indicated the election of about 55 deputies. On the other hand, the popular vote is reported to have increased by several hundred thousand over the 1914 returns, the vote amounting to from 1,700,000 to 2,000,000.

Many reasons were given for the decrease in the number of elected officials, despite the increase in the popular vote. Of primary importance was the existence of the National Bloc, a coalition of non-socialist parties that had supported the Clemenceau administration, to defeat the "bolshevism" of the Unified Socialists. A contributing cause of failure was the new electoral system. Under this new system many small districts were combined into one large one, and each voter had to cast his ballot for several candidates in the large districts, rather than for one, as formerly, who would represent his particular neighborhood. Under this system, if the National Bloc obtained a majority of votes in the Paris district, it could elect all of its candidates, even though this district contained several small socialist units, which, in previous elections, returned socialist candidates. That the districting of these larger units was manipulated in such a way as to bring the best results to the Clemenceau régime was the charge freely made by socialists. In the suburbs of Paris, where Longuet was defeated, it is claimed that 58% of the capitalist coalition elected all of the 14 delegates. If the socialists had obtained their share of seats, it is asserted, they would have returned a total throughout the country of 160 deputies.

The continuance of the war psychology was also a contributing factor in the electoral results. It is regarded as practically certain that the new government under Clemenceau, who is said to regard the election results as a great victory for his policies, will bitterly oppose the measures urged by the radical labor movement.

In late October another country held a national election—Switzerland. The *New York Times'* dispatch on this election was

headed: "Swiss Socialists Lose." It is true that Switzerland did not return a socialist government to power. The Swiss voters did, however, elect no less than 39 deputies to the National Chamber, an increase of 21. The October election raised the party to third place among the Swiss political organizations, the Radical Democrats winning out with 63 seats, the Catholic Conservatives coming next with 42, and the Peasant Party taking fourth rank with 27.

Although no national election has taken place of late in Great Britain, significant municipal elections have been held. In the 28 London boroughs, where all the councilors retire at once, the Labor Party in early November captured the majority in 13, and won seats in many others. In the country districts, labor's vote doubled in many places and increased everywhere. Even the fashionable Kensington district sent 6 Laborites to the Council. In fact, of the 1,362 candidates elected in London, 572 or 42% were members of the Labor Party! That this is a startling advance over all previous records is seen by the fact that, in the 1912 elections, labor secured but 48 seats, compared with 1,013 for the Municipal Reformers. During the intervening seven years, the strength of the Labor Party increased more than 1,000%, while that of the Municipal Reformers decreased nearly 100% (589 candidates were returned). Other parties in the November elections were left far behind (Progressive, 129; Independent, 21; Coalition, 51). The Labor Party made a gain in Manchester of 15 seats, in Liverpool of 11, in Birmingham and Bradford of 10 each.

Another bye-election in mid-November swept John Lawson, a Labor candidate, into Parliament by a majority of over 12,000. The chief issue in the mining district electing Lawson revolved around the question of mine nationalization.

With such vigorous breaths is the socialist movement in Italy, Belgium, France, Switzerland, and England "gasping its last gasps!"

H. W. L.

On September 23, 1919, by unanimous order of 2,000 miners' delegates in convention at Cleveland, officials of the United Mine Workers of America were empowered to negotiate with the operators for a 60% wage increase, a six hour day underground and a five day week. Failing a satisfactory settlement the officials were ordered to call a general strike of all bituminous coal miners on November 1st.

Two successive sessions of union leaders and mine operators failed to reach any agreement, and on October 15 the strike order was issued. Efforts by Secretary of Labor Wilson to settle the dispute during the next ten days were an equal failure. On October 25 the President himself issued a statement demanding recall of the strike order and denouncing the strike as "unjustifiable" and "unlawful."

The general committee of union leaders and district officials on October 29 rejected the President's proposal as "fiercely partisan." Federal Judge Anderson thereupon issued a temporary restraining order in answer to the government's petition, thus preventing miners' officials from giving any encouragement to the strikers and rendering the union funds useless for strike pay. A temporary injunction was granted on November 8 and a mandatory order issued requiring the officials to recall the strike order. This was done, under protest, on November 11, but none of the 400,000 striking union miners, if we are to believe the *New York Times*,¹ returned to work.

As the month elapsed increasing shortage of fuel was experienced by western states, railroad schedules were curtailed, factories placed on part time, and "lightless nights" resumed in many cities. Secretary of Labor Wilson called union officials and operators to a new conference on November 21 offering a compromise of a 31% wage increase. This offer met with acceptance by the miners' officials, but with intense bitterness of feeling

¹*New York Times*, December 11.

on the part of the operators, who contended that this offer would be surrender to the workers only comparable to the passage of the Adamson law at the demand of the railroad men in 1916. The operators, therefore, refused the compromise proposals and rested their case with Fuel Administrator Garfield, whose official approval was said to be necessary to validate a new wage agreement.

Administrator Garfield ultimately proposed a 14% wage increase as sufficient to take up the slack in the cost of living, and yet not add further to the price of coal. William McAdoo, former Secretary of the Treasury, asserted at this period that mine operators made profits in 1917 ranging from 15% to 2,000%, many of them getting back their total capital invested several times over.

Inasmuch as the miners themselves still persisted in continuing the strike, irrespective of the rescinding order of their officials, contempt of court proceedings were instituted by the government against 84 union leaders of the U. M. W. of A. for alleged disobedience of the injunction. The implication of this further government action was plainly that the strike must be caused and continued only by leaders and "agitators." Special Assistant U. S. District Attorney Simms even went so far as to insist that "the individual miner is violating the law, the injunction order, and the laws of the union if he refrains from working!"¹

Finally, on December 9, President Wilson again intervened personally approving the 14% wage increase offered by Garfield on the understanding that the operators would not raise the price of coal. He offered, moreover, a commission of inquiry, to be appointed immediately upon resumption of work, consisting of three persons representing operators, miners, and the public respectively, with the power to consider wages and working conditions, profits on and prices of bituminous coal; the commission to report in sixty days at the latest.

After prolonged and animated debate behind closed doors the conference of miners'

leaders at Indianapolis finally accepted President Wilson's proposal and the strike "officially" ended—for the second time!—on the afternoon of December 10.

Acting President John L. Lewis and Secretary-Treasurer William Green sent out the telegraphic call to end the strike and promised the reassembly of the international convention of mine delegates at Columbus, O., for fuller explanation of their official action, "after the mines all resume normal production."

On December 16 the operators themselves reported that the men were by no means all returning to work, the percentage of working miners varying from only 10% in Franklin County, Illinois, to 50% in Iowa and Ohio. In Indiana alone were nearly 100% of the men back at work. It remains to be seen whether the leaders really can send the men back without referring the settlement to the international convention of the 2,000 delegates who originally ordered the strike.

Strike Results

Some three important aspects of this strike are worthy of note. In the first place, as the foregoing bare recital of events has shown, this has been from inception to the present moment emphatically not a *leaders'*, but overwhelmingly a *workers'* strike, a large-scale example of "mass action" which no court injunction could effectively meet. Again and again during the strenuous and critical weeks from October 15 to December 10 there has been a constant keen battle between the more conservative union officials on the one side and the few "radical" leaders with the ranks of elected delegates behind them on the other.

Secondly, Pres. Gompers of the A. F. of L. has pretty effectively proved that pledge after pledge was given him by government members, from the highest downwards, that if the Lever bill were carried into law the administration "would not construe this bill as prohibiting strikes and peaceful picketing and will not so construe the bill, and that *the Department of Justice does not so construe the bill and will not so construe the bill.*"¹

¹Senator Huston on floor of Senate just previous to passage of Lever bill. Cong. Record 65th Congress. 1st Session. p. 5904.

¹*New York Times*, November 18.

The Supreme Court (*Paine Lumber Co. v. Nal.*) held at this period that private individuals could not instigate legal proceedings under anti-trust legislation, thus making it apparent that *"only the government could institute proceedings—and the government had given assurance it would not."*² Federal Attorney Palmer, commenting on the final settlement declares "the supremacy of the law has been established and *a precedent of incalculable value has been set for the peaceful, orderly and lawful adjustment of industrial disputes*" (italics ours).

There is no question that this precedent, if allowed to go unquestioned, will be, and indeed is already being, used for rapid suppression of industrial strikes, and ultimately of organized unions. If such be the result, labor is back in the days of 1809 when Recorder Levy of Philadelphia fined a group of cordwainers on the charge of conspiring to raise wages. Even when the Lever Act expires such war precedent will tend to make public opinion ready for anti-strike and anti-union campaigns.

The third, and, to socialists, most interesting aspect of all is the publicity given to possible nationalization of the coal mines. North Dakota led the states in operating its own mines. North Dakota was, indeed, the only state where the miners kept at work after November 1st in the hope Governor Frazier could bring the operators to terms. Only upon his failure to do so did the North Dakota miners join the national strike. Governor Frazier then declared martial law, took over and ran the lignite mines. The workers returned to work with no wage increase, only stipulating that profiteering by the operators cease. The state paid 20 cents a ton royalty to the operators for use of the mines and, for North Dakota, the strike was over. In the first week of state operation enough coal was mined to supply 25,000 families. Promptly the Washburn Coal Co., an out-of-state concern, operating North Dakota mines, obtained

injunctions compelling Governor Frazier to return their mines, the judge declaring "the courts are the bulwarks of freedom . . . for protection of life, liberty and property" and that the military "may not be used to take from him that has and give to him that has not"!³ North Dakota Legislature replied to this action by passing a law effective July 1, 1920, authorizing the Governor to "take over and operate any coal mine or other utility in any emergency when necessary for the protection of life and property." Missouri and Kansas also took over their mines, Gov. Gardner of Missouri using drastic martial law, making his coal fields a "big military camp" where no public meetings were allowed and no members of the public permitted to visit the quarters of the working miners.

In view of the tremendous pressure now exerted by British miners upon their government to carry out the Sankey Commission report and nationalize the coal mines, and the equally striking statement at Cleveland of the 2,000 delegates of the U. M. W. of America that "we hold that the coal supply of our nation should be owned by the Commonwealth and operated in the interest of and for the use and comfort of all of the people of the Commonwealth," and finally in view of their demand that the U. S. government acquire the mines by purchase and give the mine workers equal representation with the government on all boards of control and management, the fear expressed by many conservative organs is explanatory of the extreme venom injected into this whole strike dispute by the press, and of the stubborn refusal by the operators to prevent a strike by agreement with the mine leaders. "These strikers," says the *Times* (December 12), "formally declared for 'the nationalization and democratic management of all coal mines in the United States' . . . They should understand that no strikers can start soviets in this country!" A better example of (coal) dust thrown in the eyes of the public could scarcely be conceived. W. H. C.

²Samuel Gompers in mass meeting under Washington, D. C., Central Labor Union auspices, November 22nd.

³*New York Times*, November 22.

A Talk With Tom Mann

Walter G. Fuller

To those readers of THE SOCIALIST REVIEW who are interested in the British scene I would say, "Keep your eye on Tom Mann." A new act in the great melodrama of life is just beginning over there and Tom Mann is going to play a big part in the development of the plot. It is more than likely that there will be something doing whenever he is on the stage—and in the act now proceeding he has made his entrance in dramatic fashion.

A few months ago it was reported that on the score of age—he is sixty-four—Tom Mann had decided to retire from labor's active list, but about midsummer, in response to an urgent appeal, he consented to stand as a candidate for the general secretaryship of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, one of the biggest organizations of skilled workers in Britain. He was elected by an overwhelming majority. This is an event of more real importance than the return of Arthur Henderson to Parliament, for the A.S.E. is the home of the shop steward movement; and it was the rank and file of the A.S.E. who started the formidable 40-hour general strike in Glasgow last winter. Tom Mann in the secretary's office means that the revolutionary element is in control.

A few days before the result of the A.S.E. election was known I met Tom Mann in London. I caught sight of him as he crossed the hotel lobby, an alert sturdy figure in brown—brown skin, brown eyes, brown clothes and boots. He walked straight over to the desk and without a word or a glance around, opened a little brown bag that he was carrying and took from it a white rose. "From my garden," I heard him say with a gardener's pride as he presented it with an unconscious and un-English grace to the girl behind the counter. Then turning quickly as his manner is, he saw me coming towards him. A welcoming hand shot out and a friendly greeting, "Let's have our talk over here," pointing to a quiet corner, "it couldn't

be better." All this again with a vitality and a ready friendliness which seems to be generally lacking among these British islanders.

Russia the "Acid Test"

The news in the morning papers gave us a conversational start, and once more I found that President Wilson was right, Russia is the acid test. Tom Mann's reaction to the acid was an emphatic, "Of course I stand ab-so-lute-ly" (giving all four syllables self-determination) "for the Russian soviets." Then with deliberation, "I am in favor of any action—the most drastic conceivable" (I saw the words stand out in italics as he spoke) "to secure the immediate withdrawal of British troops and the recognition of the Soviet Government. But mind you"—with a warning finger—"there are relatively few in the labor movement here who would agree with me on that. We are only a small minority, but this much can be said"—carefully weighing his words—"feeling is growing stronger every day in the ranks of British labor against intervention in Russia. But," admonitory finger again, "that does not mean that we shall resort to any 'direct action' on Russia's behalf."

"British labor, then, will do nothing actively for Russia?"

"Nothing, I am afraid, that's worth while, nothing that costs anything. The movement has always to carry a big dead weight of ignorance, prejudice, indifference—. You know what I mean," then with a smile at the relief the word gave him—"fat-headed."

"But hasn't the war cleared away some of that superfluous fat?"

"That's true," slowly, "the war has done that," then back to his usual speed and confidence, "and yet the war has added new fat of its own." Then grimly, "Victory fat. So we're pretty much the same as before."

But this was too pessimistic a view to

stay long with Tom Mann. He broke through the cloud with "Oh, but don't mistake me. British labor is on the way. We're moving faster than ever before. In fact," here he leaned closer to me, "we're travelling as fast as it is safe to go. We're nearly up to the speed limit."

British Labor Travelling Fast

And then a forceful and vivid image struck his imagination, "British labor today is like a team in double harness," and he sat himself forward on the couch, erect and vigorous, "with one section, it's 'Go ahead, go ahead, go ahead!' all the time," his right hand cracked an imaginary whip, "with the other it's 'Caution, caution there, caution!'" and he stretched out his left-hand palm downwards as if calming a galloping horse. So for a moment he sat dramatically repeating his image.

"How strong is that fast horse?" I asked, pointing to the restive creature on the left, "What percentage does he represent?"

"From 10 to 15 per cent. of the whole movement," said Tom Mann without hesitation, and then with absolute conviction, "When it's twenty per cent. strong we shall have the revolution."

"Is it so near?"

"Oh, the revolution is coming all right. I'm not worrying. It cannot be stopped. Shall we be ready for it? That's the question. The danger is that the other side will bring it on too soon—before we're ready."

"How can they do that?"

The "Coöps"

"By provoking a premature general strike, or if they can't do it that way by a general lockout and then——" he threw up his strong brown hands. "But all the same I believe we shall win. After the Russian revolution it's apple pie for us. Russia has blazed the trail for all the world. Russian experience shows that one of the first things we must do here is to capture the coöperative movement. That's why I tell every trade unionist to get into the coöps."

"What good will that do?" I asked.

Tom Mann's answer came back ready as if he had dealt with that question before. "First, because the wiping out of the capitalist system means the establishment of the coöperative commonwealth. Then let us get our hands in at the new system. We must know how to handle the ropes. Let us practice coöperation even as it is today with all its limitations. And second, because in the coöps we have some of the machinery of production and distribution already in our hands. And that is what we *must* have if we are to win. The first day of the revolution will take care of itself. But what about our food on the second day? It is the coöps who will distribute the bread. The coöps will be our commissariat. Why, do you know that already the British coöps have farms and ships of their own?" Then, as the thought struck him, he added with enthusiasm, "British coöps could trade with Soviet Russia today if they liked. There is nothing to prevent them."

"Only the British navy," I said.

"Yes," Tom Mann rejoined, "true enough, but I'd like to see a British warship sink a British coöp trader. They'd never dare do it. They'd never dare."

"But the coöp leaders are not the men for such adventures," I said.

"I know that," he agreed, "that's why I tell trade unionists everywhere to get into the coöps and change them."

"And get new leaders?" I suggested.

The Rank and File

I was hardly prepared for the explosive force of the "NO!" that came in response. "No, we want no more leaders. In union, shop committees, and coöps it must be rank and file, rank and file, all the time."

"But you're a bit of a leader yourself," I said, "and it looks as though you're going to be the new secretary of the A.S.E."

He smiled, "Yes, but I'm not elected yet, and, anyway, my platform is all for action by the rank and file."

"One last question. What about nationalization?"

"Oh! I take no great joy in that word. I'm a syndicalist, a bolshevist, anything but a state-ist. Let the mines, the railways, and the rest be nationalized under the capitalist system and where they now chastise us with whips they will chastise us with scorpions!

No, it won't work under the present system; we must have the revolution first."

With that we shook hands and parted, but not before he had fastened a white rose—"from my garden"—in my button-hole. He left with me too something of his fresh, youthful spirit, his courage and his strength.

The Steel Strike and the Bill of Rights

"E. N."

A visit to Pittsburgh and its environs gives a socialist the opportunity of seeing not only the actual battlefield of the class struggle, but, in addition, perhaps, affords him the satisfaction of finding that his analysis of the industrial problem is a correct one. It is true that the battle of classes is now raging throughout the world. It is, however, in this portion of Pennsylvania that the worst cannonading goes on, that the heaviest fortresses are located. A bird's-eye view of the situation, as witnessed during the third and fourth weeks of the steel strike, may therefore prove not altogether valueless.

Entering the industrial battle zone one immediately becomes aware of the alignment of the various institutions and groups in the population, of the newspapers, the churches and ministers, the business men and merchants, the local, county, and state officials. It is also easy to see who among the "conservative" labor leaders are for the steel workers and who are against them.

The press is solidly opposed to the strikers. Even the so-called "workingmen's newspaper" of Pittsburgh, on the day when the Senate Committee on Labor and Education came to investigate the strike situation in that city, felt free to remind these officials in a front page editorial:

"You are invited to come here by outsiders, some of whom are revolutionaries. In Pittsburgh we are intensely human. The injury to one is the concern of all. Our people have the true spirit. They would not permit injustice to be done anyone, no matter what his race, creed, or country might be. Our population is an honest, patriotic,

sympathetic, and God-fearing people, who would not permit cruelty to be practiced, and it is not necessary for any outside committee to come to this territory to right our wrongs. You should call as witnesses only American citizens, and . . . you should exclude all persons of foreign birth . . . as all Pittsburgh wants and asks is that you hear what real Pittsburghers will tell you."

The editor also urged the Senators to tell the truth.

In the Pittsburgh territory, a few business men indeed favored the extending of credit to the strikers for the entire duration of the strike. On the other hand, one discovered the Mayor in one town calling together all of the property holders and merchants and instructing them to make the striking employees pay cash for their goods, and to compel the workers to hand over their rent on the first of each month. In case this latter demand was not complied with, the landlords were urged to eject the strikers from their houses.

As to the church—one Catholic priest is continually unearthing valuable material for the strikers, his hopes concentrated upon the realization of "the one big union" and for whom "the social revolution cannot come too fast"; while another priest in a circular letter, written in several foreign languages, and sent by mail to the strikers' homes, was engaged in reminding the workers of the "pots of flesh and plenty" which the "factories" had given them and of the three dollar dues they paid into the union. The circular concluded with the warning: "W. Z. Foster is not a Catholic, but a dangerous anarchist, and to listen to him is a sin, which will bring all to

hell." The rest of the clergy are, for the most part, publicly and definitely aligned with the owners of the industry and are energetically working against the strikers.

In the Pittsburgh "Iron City Trades Council," the Central Labor Body of the city, an old centre of reaction, one now finds radical resolutions adopted by unanimous vote, while conservative leaders are being arrested and beaten up, only to go forth cheerfully the next day to be rearrested. It is also in Pittsburgh and vicinity that "Americanism" to a great part of the population has apparently become synonymous with "scabbing" and strike-breaking. Full page advertisements in the daily press, containing a picture of Uncle Sam, with one arm around the shoulder of a workman, and the other pointing to the American flag, appear daily and urge:

"BOYS! LET'S BE 100% AMERICAN NOW."

"The steel strike has failed and labor has again shown its contempt for radicalism and its loyalty to America.

"Thank God that the principles of American liberty and independence are still safe.

"Stick to your job—help keep the country prosperous.

"GO BACK TO WORK!"

And as most of Gary's "100% Americans" cannot read English, this is repeated in seven foreign languages, among them even the one used by the condemned Bolsheviks!

In the city of Pittsburgh were located the offices of the national secretary, the attorneys, the organizers, the publicity, complaint, speakers', and other departments of the steel workers, and in addition to the several stenographers pounding away on their typewriters were to be found a crowd of strikers, newspapermen, and visitors. The little room was continually packed with people and important transactions had to be carried through in the hall-way, under the transoms of several stock-brokers' offices. (It was not until the end of the third week of the strike that two additional rooms were engaged by the Committee. I am told that the Steel Corporation kept a man there continuously, as one could stand there practically all day without being noticed.)

A recital of the outrages perpetrated by the mill bosses and company guards, special deputies, State Constabulary, and the local and county officials would fill several volumes. In every strike community scores were arrested, in some towns, hundreds. The strike leaders were in no position to know definitely the number of arrests made or the total amount of fines and bails demanded and exacted. The local authorities, in most instances, however, gave me the statements regarding the number of arrests and the amounts of bail as claimed by the strike leaders. At New Castle, for instance, the chief of police admitted that, in the first week, they "had made 100 arrests of strikers; that these were charged with 'suspicion,' 'disorderly conduct,' and 'carrying concealed weapons'; that bail was fixed from \$1,000 to \$1,500, but that those held on suspicion could not be released on bail, and that, of the 100 arrests, 40 were charged with 'suspicion.'" He also admitted that no hearings were being held, and that men were generally confined for ten days, or that it was the intention of the authorities to hold them for the period of the strike, "even if the officials had to build a new jail in which to house them."

The Deputies

The sheriff of that county also admitted that, during the first week, "he had deputized more than 500 men, of whom 265 were members of the Board of Trade, while the rest were ex-soldiers." And these did not include those sworn under the coal and iron police law. During the hearings before the Senate Committee in Pittsburgh, the leader of the Monessen "Vigilantes" admitted that, during the first few days, this organization had sworn in over 900 people as deputies and that, on the third day of the strike, when the "Vigilantes" were determined to break up a parade, "there were only 57 men armed with rifles, besides the State Constabulary, mill deputies, and the local police force."¹

¹ It was brought out before the Senate Committee from the testimony of Captain Hunter, the leader of the "Vigilantes," that the population of Monessen was estimated to be about 22,000, of

Miss Gertrude Gordon, correspondent for the *Pittsburgh Press*, writing in that paper on October 8, thus describes her visit to Monessen:

"A curious circumstance happened when I tried to find out details regarding the arrests of ten men yesterday. According to the strike sympathizers, these men were walking along the street and the state troopers herded them down this street which leads to one of the mill's entrances, and into the mill. They declared they were asked to sign up that they would come to work. They refused and were arrested, they allege.

"I asked Lieut. Albright [of the police force] where the men were. 'They were given a hearing before Squire Shuster,' I was told. I went to Squire Shuster. 'They were given a hearing by Squire White,' he told me. Squire White said: 'They were given a hearing before Burgess Steward.' When Burgess Steward was approached, he said: 'They were given a hearing before Squire White, charged with conducting themselves unlawfully, and were held for court on \$500 bail.'"

"The Iron Heel"

A brief survey of the hundreds of affidavits now collected in the steel strike districts reveals a situation that vividly recalls Jack London's *Iron Heel*. The sworn statements tell how peaceful meetings of strikers were suddenly broken up and how men, women, and children were clubbed, trampled upon by horses, and then jailed and fined. They declare that the American flag was torn and trampled upon by horses of State troopers; they describe how business men who displayed sympathy for the strikers were arrested and beaten up. They tell how peaceful and respectable homes were broken into, how the strikers' property was destroyed, and how men and women were taken out of their beds and dragged to jail without being permitted to dress. Mothers with babies in their arms were torn from their homes and food refused to their children for hours, even though these victims were able to pay for nourishment. A young woman, scarcely over one hundred pounds in weight, was taken from her hus-

whom not more than 2,000 were American citizens. When a Senator inquired about their Americanization program, Senator Walsh aptly remarked: "It would seem that the problem is rather of foreignization than Americanization."

band, according to one of the affidavits, and, with babe in arms, hauled to jail, charged with "attacking two State policemen," and fined \$50!

Evidence was furnished of shots fired at citizens' homes and of homes of native citizens searched without warrants. Strikers were locked in cellars and threatened with hanging in the morning if they did not go back to work. Business men were molested, and race and religious issues were aroused by newspapers and circulars distributed by the companies. Attorneys were not permitted to consult with their clients, and were refused transcripts of cases. Men and women were attacked as they were leaving church on a Sunday, and children, as they were assembled in the school yard, were ridden down by State troopers with their horses, in the hope, it seemed, that such action would incite their parents "to start something."

The Senate Committee

The recital of many of these outrages before the Senators during their hearing in Pittsburgh prompted Senator Walsh to urge the attorney of the strikers to see that justice was done to these people and that "the fullest publicity be given to such cases." "For," he declared, "we can't let the impression get out among foreigners that this is the way our laws are administered." Indeed, of the fifteen hours of testimony taken by the Senate Committee in the Federal Building, in Pittsburgh, on October 11 and 12, the strikers' side consumed at least twelve of these.

Much of the testimony was not at all to the liking of the Senate Committee. To anyone attending the hearing it was obvious that, with the exception of Senator Walsh of Massachusetts, all the other members of the Committee were either prejudiced against the strikers beforehand, or were not at all interested in the steel strike, save in relation to their different hobbies, like "Americanization." When a man would tell them that he was striking because he was compelled to work fourteen hours a day, including Sundays, and wanted more leisure, they would ask him why he didn't go to night school, or

what were the causes of the war. And some of the answers given to these questions were not at all of the kind the Senators anticipated. Thus a young Slav told the Senators how he was arrested without any provocation, locked in a cell, and beaten up inside by the son of the town policeman, while the father was holding a gun and watched that he did not retaliate. When asked what country he came from, he answered that he didn't know himself to what country he now belonged, as "they are still fighting around there." He was then asked whether he knew the difference between the government of his country and the government of the United States, and he replied: "Yes, my country governed by king, this country governed by superintendent."

The Governor of Pennsylvania

When James H. Maurer, President of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, called attention to these atrocities in western Pennsylvania, in a speech at Chicago, Governor William C. Sproul of Pennsylvania, after receiving a report of the speech, sent him a letter saying that he had received this report, but that those in a position to know regarded it as absolutely false. He regretted that Mr. Maurer should misrepresent the great Com-

monwealth of Pennsylvania. In reply to this, Maurer sent him a letter which not only substantiated, by numerous affidavits, every charge made, but which also contained affidavits of numerous other charges. On the day when the Governor was scheduled to speak at a public meeting in Erie, Pa., the Central Labor Body of that city, in a half-page newspaper advertisement, in all the local papers, addressed the following questions to him:

"TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR,
WILLIAM C. SPROUL:

"Do you approve the denial of the right of assemblage and free speech of the striking steel workers in this State?

"Do you approve of the manner in which justice is dealt out by officials in the strike centers of this State?

"Do you think it your duty as Governor of this State to order an official investigation of the conditions existing in the strike districts, especially those relating to the death of Mrs. Fanny Selins?

"Do you approve of the actions and the methods employed by the State Police in the strike districts?
Signed

"ERIE CENTRAL LABOR UNION."

To all of these questions the Governor replied in his speech at Erie: "I am perfectly well satisfied with the State police and was never prouder of them than I am today."

Injunctions and Politics

G. N.

The coal strike is a symptom of a social maladjustment which will continue to work havoc with the productive processes of the country until the coal mines are socialized. The miners realize that they are engaged in a key industry upon which rests the whole structure of economic production.

The industry is conducted for the private profit of the operators. So long as the operators continue to draw dividends ranging up to 2,000% on their investment and mine owners draw royalties without rendering service to society in return, discontent and unrest vitally interfering with the processes of pro-

duction are bound to recur with disastrous results upon the whole structure of modern industry.

With a group of workers who have become not only class conscious as a result of the profiteering and exploitation which they have witnessed during the war, but also conscious of their power of control over an industry so basic as that which supplies the main source of power to modern civilization, the problem of continued and increasing production of coal can only be solved by replacing the motive of private profit by the larger motive of the welfare of society. This means

the socialization of the mining industries, sooner or later, and the longer it is delayed the more disastrously will these crises recur.

The coal strike of 1919 is significant not only of the fundamental social maladjustment which threatens increasingly the future of all industry, but also of the coming struggle to control economic power by the use of the political weapon. The injunction against the coal miners must be looked upon as one of a series of vain efforts by political forces to regain control of economic forces which make their impact outside the realm of the present political state.

The theory of Judge Anderson's injunction was based on the fallacy, characteristic of ruling class thought on industrial questions, that it was a strike of the leaders, and that if these leaders could be rendered powerless, or intimidated into submission, the miners, no longer "misled" by them, would contentedly return to their jobs. Now the outstanding characteristic of the labor movement since the war is its manifestation as a mass movement in which the whole pressure for direct action comes from the ranks, and in which the leaders act mainly as a conservative brake-power resisting the mass pressure for radical action. When the miners failed to return to work, despite the calling off of the strike by the leaders, in obedience to the orders of the court, the true character of the strike as a mass movement became apparent.

When the injunction manifestly failed to prevent the strike, why was it not called off? Because a new and more important use for it was discovered. The injunction is not a method of preventing strikes. It is a method of weakening the power of the workers in a critical struggle. The political state, by using the whole power of its judicial machinery, can deprive the miners of their leadership, paralyze their organization, impound their funds and threaten them with starvation, and generally place them in the position of criminals before the public eye.

For the first time, many thousands of workers feel that the government is arrayed against them and is coöperating with the coal operators whose profiteering and exploitation they came to know so well during the war. The pretense of the neutrality of the political state in economic conflicts has been shattered beyond repair in the minds of thousands. They feel that the socialists were right when they contended that government was essentially a class government controlled apparently by an exploiting, profiteering class.

The result of this new attitude will be one of two alternatives: either the discrediting of the political state and class government in the mind of the worker, who will rely increasingly upon the power of direct action in the economic field; or a determination to capture this political power now arrayed against him in order to use it as a weapon on his own side of the class struggle.

Problems of the Revolutionized Order

Notes on the Conference of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society at Highland, New York,
June 24-30, 1919.

(Continued from page 57, December, 1919)

Harry W. Laidler

Thursday afternoon an informal debate took place between Albert Rhys Williams and Joseph Shaplin regarding the merits of the Soviet government. Shaplin took the position of certain Marxists that Socialism could not evolve from a peasant population, and condemned the alleged excesses of the Bolsheviki. He also condemned Kolchak, and de-

clared his opposition to military intervention. Williams spoke of the constructive work of the Bolsheviki, and of the terrible obstacles placed in their path. He drew attention to the fact that some of the bitterest opponents of the Bolsheviki were orthodox socialists who were sorely disappointed because the revolution failed to take a course similar to

their preconceived notions. Many non-socialist correspondents, on the other hand, viewing the situation in an unprejudiced fashion, became ardent supporters of the soviets.

At another session, Anna Strunsky Walling affirmed that the Social Revolutionists formerly criticized the Social Democrats for their lack of faith in the social vision of the peasants. Now many of them are criticizing the Bolsheviks for possessing so much faith in the social vision of the agrarian as to believe that a socialist state can be built up in a country where the peasant constitutes a considerable proportion of the population.

The Bolsheviks vs. Kolchak

The Russian question again came up for discussion at the Saturday night session on "The Individual and the State." Gregory Zilboorg, secretary of the Ministry of Labor under Kerensky, declared that at this present juncture, no matter how much a socialist might disagree with the tactics of the Bolsheviks, he must take his stand with the Bolsheviks or with the monarchist Kolchak. Unfortunately only one choice could consistently be made,—a socialist must align himself on the side of the Soviet government. Zilboorg, however, contended that the Bolsheviks were committing a grave error in failing to adopt higher ethical means in the attainment of their goal. The pressure of the whole world, organized for war, demanding unconditional subordination to imperialistic tendencies, forced Russia into the Bolshevik period of revolution.

Bolshevism was not a creative theory, but a spontaneous one of emotional origin. Three months before the October revolution it had neither a definite theory nor a definite practical program. The Bolshevik revolution was not an illustration of any transition to a new social order, but a temporary rearrangement of social groups without any change of methods. That was the basic point of weakness, because the state of the future presupposes a change of methods as well as of fundamental conceptions. The state of the

future should be based on the greatest development of solidarity and the harmonious accord of the free individual creative spirit with the organic development of the community.

The Individual and the State

Norman Thomas, who followed Mr. Zilboorg in the discussion of the state and the individual, took a similar position. Mr. Thomas declared:

"By implication, and perhaps directly, what I shall say will attack certain parts of the Bolshevik theory. Therefore, to avoid any misunderstanding, may I make it perfectly clear that I think few crimes in history have equalled the ruthlessness in Russia. Bolshevism is an experiment of extraordinary interest which the rest of the world, had it been wise, would have watched eagerly in order to learn the tremendous lessons for the future social reorganization. Instead, because, to quote Frank Vanderlip, 'capital has no point of contact with Bolshevism,' we have magnified a hundred or a thousand times their atrocities, we have starved women and children, we have aided corrupt dictators; and all of these we have done in the name of morality and decency the very moment when we recognized Mannerheim, the Finnish butcher, and the arch reactionary, Kolchak, whose government rests on whips and vodka.

Problems of the Revolutionized Order

"I do not think that it is adequate psychology which finds in greed for profits and the capitalist system the sole explanation for all our ills. There is also a spirit of dominance in the principles of proletarianism which finds embodiment in the political state, and authority may persist even under a socialist commonwealth. No one can study history, or observe for example the development of the A. F. of L., without recognizing that not all of the evils of which we complain are exclusively the property of the political state.

"I shall confess that for my part, Kropotkin's idea of communistic anarchism seems to me the highest and best form for reconciling the interests of the individual and the social group. I question whether we could immediately turn from our present system to Kropotkin's ideals. An intermediary state of great value seems to be that of guild socialism, with its frank recognition of the futility of trying to find some sovereign power outside of the individual. The pluralistic idea of gathering up men's loyalties in at least two co-ordinate forms of organization, the state to rep-

resent their interest as consumers, and the guild parliament as producers, seems to me very hopeful.

The Guildsman's Dream

The Soviet State—in its practical and theoretical bearings—was not the only phase of the state discussed at the conference. Ordway Tead, author of "Instincts in Industry," presented the challenge of the Guild Socialist State, the ideal of which was the development of personality—the good life.

"The function of the state," he declared, "is to be tested, not on any deductive grounds. The guild idea is that that economic or civic body which would naturally perform a given function, shall have the power and authority to perform it. The guild theory of the state denies the notion of absolute sovereignty and declares for a division of sovereignty between bodies representing consumers and those representing producers. It believes that by developing institutions which are based on this theory, the guild system is peculiarly in a position to secure freedom to the individual, equality of status through equal dignity of function, free association, the fullest possible education."

Marxism and Guild Socialism

Boudin and Laidler challenged the distinction made by Tead between the National Guildsman's and the Marxist's conception of the state, and declared that the Marxist, as well as the guild socialist, emphasized democratic management, and opposed bureaucratic state socialism. The aim of the Marxist was no mechanical form of industry, but an organization of society under which human personality would be best subserved. Boudin argued that the idea of dual sovereignty, as propounded by some of the Guildsmen, was impractical. He also averred that the socialist movement the world over had given as much attention to industrial organization as it had to political groupings, and mentioned the part played by the socialists in Europe in the development of the trade union movement.

A brilliant paper on "Liberty in the Workshop," a plea for democratic management as a prerequisite for liberty under the state was delivered by Felix Grendon. This paper was published in the December *SOCIALIST REVIEW*.

Socialism and Efficient Production

An entirely new angle in socialist discussion was presented in an intensely interesting fashion by Walter Polakov, an efficiency expert. Mr. Polakov, in dealing with the question of the "Technique of production and the revolutionized order," prefaced his remarks with the assertion that engineers and scientists were today so inadequately compensated that they were taking up other lines of endeavor, and that, unless a distinct change in policy was made, the next generation would be without specialists.

Dealing with the inefficiency of the present system of production, the speaker declared that recent investigations had shown that machinery in the modern factory was utilized to but 50 per cent. of its capacity during the normal working day, and that the utilization of the average locomotive was about 17 per cent. During the war this percentage was, of course, considerably higher.

"In the first period of the scientific management movement, anyone who could obtain a regular position felt qualified to call himself an efficiency engineer, and endeavored to give advice regarding increased output. Employers were generally told that the chief trouble lay with the worker. This period is passing away. A new and higher type of efficiency engineer is evolving. The chief criticism of the new engineer centers around the inefficiency of the manager, rather than of the workman. He does not depend for increased production upon the stop watch. He aims to serve production at the smallest expense of human energy, by the best utilization of machinery, and by the utilization of industrial waste. To burn one ton of coal more than is necessary in order to develop a certain power is, he believes, an irretrievable loss to a miner's life."

Democracy in the Shop

Although the problem of democratic management in industry was scheduled for discussion on Friday night, the challenge of democratic control ran through the entire conference. Vida D. Scudder, in the Thursday morning discussion, drew a vivid and pathetic picture of the teaching force under democratic control, rushing hither and thither to a thousand and one committee meetings, and denied even the leisure now vouchsafed

for creative work. "It may be," she concluded, "that we ought to welcome this advance toward democratic control, from the stern sense of duty, but let us teachers not fool ourselves into the belief that such control will serve as a great liberating force, it will but forge for us additional chains!" Tead, Grendon and others, on the other hand, emphasized the advantages of democratic control.

The Plumb Plan

On Thursday evening Glenn E. Plumb, the attorney of the railway brotherhoods, explained his plan under which the railroads were to be publicly owned, the actual management being placed in the hands of a board of directors, one-third of whom were to be appointed by the President of the United States, one-third by the administrative officers and one-third by the workers generally.

He declared that already 6,000,000 workers had indorsed this plan, and that, within a short time, a very extensive publicity campaign would be conducted in its behalf. In describing his proposal, the speaker declared that it did not grow out of guild socialism or any other economic theory. He believed that if, instead of paying 6½ per cent. annual interest on nineteen billion dollars of alleged investment in the private railroads, or \$1,300,000,000 a year, the public took over the railroads and paid 3½ or 4 per cent. on the actual value of the railroads of ten or twelve billion dollars, there would be an annual saving to the public of something like \$850,000,000. This would cover the present deficit of \$236,000,000 and leave a very considerable surplus,—about half a billion dollars.

Shop management, permeated by the democratic spirit, was again debated on Friday evening by Robert W. Bruère, director of the Bureau of Industrial Research, and Leland Olds, formerly of the War Labor Board. Olds maintained that radicals should beware of schemes of alleged democratic control fostered by employers for the purpose of allaying discontent, schemes which, in reality, gave nothing but advisory power to the work-

ers. They should seek to organize the workers, inducing them to demand more power for themselves. Mr. Bruère discussed various aspects of the Plumb plan, and advised the so-called intellectuals to master the technique of production and to place their technical knowledge at the service of labor. This, rather than their general opinion concerning social problems, he declared, is what labor needs at the present time.

Revolution

The problem of violence, the state, and revolution, was discussed further at the Sunday morning session, and brought forth one of the most animated hecklings of the conference.

Mr. Louis Boudin contrasted the view of Sorel that nothing was ever gained except through violence, with that of certain pacifists who declared that all violence was futile. A logical case, he asserted, could be presented for both points of view. Marx tried to find out not what was the desirable course, but what were the actual facts in the situation. There is no evolution, he maintained, that does not evolve into a revolution. To Marx, violence was the mid-wife of history.

"Artificial violence, as in the case of the surgical operation at child-birth, may assist in the revolutionary process. This artificial violence does not mean more violence. If the surgeon is skilful, it will mean less violence. Similarly it is necessary for the social surgeon to understand the revolution, to know when it is due. Otherwise an attempt to stimulate it artificially will merely result in an abortion. Those are true revolutionists who understand the revolutionary process, and who are ready to make way for the revolution when the revolution is ripe, not those who are trying to assist in the revolution before the right stage is reached."

The World Federation

Nor were the problems of the coming inter-nation entirely neglected at these gatherings. On Sunday afternoon, Jessie W. Hughan, Professor Nathaniel Schmidt of Cornell, and Lajpat Rai of India dealt with some of the fundamentals of a real democratic world federation, and gave their opinions concerning

the League of Nations. Dr. Hughan dealt particularly with the proper method of apportioning representatives to any democratic federation. She said in part:

"It is a truism that wars are made not by peoples but by states and the interests which control them. Only a league that places international affairs in the hands of the population as such can make even the first step toward world peace. Democracy, moreover, can evolve only in so far as the political unit is reduced to its lowest terms, neither the empire, nor even the self-governing community, but the free man or woman. The principles of the referendum and of proportional representation are genuine steps toward democracy. The principle of self-determination, however, though sound in itself, is yet playing into the hands of the old-style diplomats by fostering a false democracy of states rather than of peoples. *There is only one device by which the league of states may be made a league of peoples, and that is by constituting as 'the high contracting power' not the government but the human being. This change may be made by adopting as the standard of representation not a nominal national equality as at present but a number proportional to the actually enfranchised population of the group.* Just as collectivism of the Standard Oil could not evolve into social democracy, so the league of exploiting governments can never develop into the League of Nations. Both may indeed furnish the outward machinery of the change, but neither is to be counted as a force in world betterment until this machinery shall be possessed by the people, not for the imperialists, but for humanity."

Professor Nathaniel Schmidt favored a similar plan of representation and pointed out many of the inadequacies of the present League. A democratic league, he maintained, should not be a league of diplomatic agents but of men and women representatives of the public and of vocational groups. It should provide for disarmament, for a rational colonial policy, for a representative parliament, and not for an undemocratic council.

Lajpat Rai voiced the protest of the Asiatic to the League. In dealing with India, he declared that the workers of that country were giving ever increasing attention to the general strike, to passive resistance as a weapon of democracy, and vividly described how the extensive strike of April last so welded the population together that Hindus

were found giving sermons in Mohammedan mosques, and vice versa. Unless justice were done to the Asiatic, Japan might be found in the future the leader of the Asiatic countries in a movement of opposition to the white peoples of Europe and America.

Revolutionized Culture

The evolving culture of the revolutionized order, and the increased demand of the workers for a more complete education was the topic of the last session of the conference on Sunday evening. Dr. Dana, the chairman of the meeting, drew attention to the growth of such workingmen's institutions as the Rand School, the United Labor Educational Committee, the Educational Committee of the International Ladies' Garment Workers of New York, the Labor College of Boston, and educational experiments in Seattle and Minneapolis as a counterpart of the many experiments of the European workers. Mr. Budish of the United Labor Educational Committee declared that more than 200,000 workers in New York had united on a plan to supply their membership with the best music, art, drama, and with courses in economics.

Bruno Lasker of the Survey, dealing with the forces making for a larger culture, said:

"There are certain tendencies of change so marked and so decisive that it would be folly for us not to recognize them.

"First, there is the rapid emancipation of the race from soil and climate through cheap transit. Internationalism of taste and feeling, of religion and of art is here, and cannot be lost again.

"Even more important is the revolutionary substitution of new moral sanctions for the old that must follow the socialization of land and industrial capital. Civilization so far has been built up on rights and titles created in the past. It is ever backward looking; its scraps of paper are its holiest possession, for without them there would be no economic security, no family, no firm political system, no authority. Released from the dead hand of the past to an extent which it is difficult to foresee in all its magnitude, the human race will more and more take its sanction from the future; from the requirements and interests of coming generations. The basis of religion will be prophecy rather than authority.

"Third, social equality will make for more genuineness in human relationships. With economic liberation, there will come liberation from make-believe; we shall breathe more freely in an air of reality; there will be no gain in interested propagandas, whether commercial, political or scientific. The greatest gain to humanity from social democracy will be the recovery of honesty."

Several other speakers addressed the conference, including Bishop Paul Jones, who spoke of the ethical basis for pacifism, and the inexpediency of violence, and Thomas D. Mucbe, a Labor member of the New South Wales Legislature, who told of the schism in the Labor Party due to the chauvinism of Premier Hughes, and stated that, since the armistice, the Labor Party had become increasingly larger, and increasingly more radical. Robert W. Dunn, formerly president of the Yale Chapter, and at present an organizer of the Amalgamated Textile Workers in Paterson, told of the use of violence on the

part of the employing class against organized workers in textile centers. Ellen Hayes, Louise Adams Grout, and others acted as chairmen of various sessions.

The formal conferences constituted but a part of the inspiration of conference week. The tramps amid shaded woodland to John Burroughs' old home, the camp-fire sings, the canoeing excursions through winding inlets, the gymnasium hops, arranged by the student committee, the swimming contests, and the mere passive enjoyment of the many beauties of nature in this idyllic portion of the Empire State, constituted a very real part of the enjoyment and real worth of the week; and it was during the long afternoons left free for recreation that many of the guests of the conference in intimate discussion with their comrades were able most effectively to clarify their thoughts on the much debated problems of the day.

Why Mexico?

Louis P. Lochner

Mexico is in the foreground of American imperialistic thought today for one reason—she is rich, immensely rich. "Mexico, as a country, possesses as great natural wealth as any country in the world," says E. D. Trowbridge in his *Mexico, Today and Tomorrow*. He continues:

"Her riches are in wheat and corn, in cattle, oil, hemp, gold, silver, copper, timber, fruits, coffee, tobacco, sugar, chocolate, and a thousand and one products of the soil. In two decades she has produced a billion dollars' worth of gold and silver. Her oil fields, producing eight million barrels of oil per month, have potential possibilities of producing a billion barrels of oil every year. Her vast forests of pine and mahogany have sufficient timber to supply the whole continent. With a climate which makes harvests possible the year round, with rich soil and abundance of streams, she has the means to produce sufficient crops to feed a nation six times as great as her own. For industry she has iron and coal. A hundred streams, tumbling down a mile and a half on their way to the sea, have potential power equal to half a dozen Niagaras. She is rich—immensely rich."

In the space allotted to me, I can only refer to the 988 copper mines which have as yet but scratched the surface; the 5,804 silver mines which during nine months in 1918 produced 5,341,376 troy ounces, or 33% of the world's supply of silver; the 1,800 gold mines which, though producing only on a small scale as yet, are nevertheless supplying one-twentieth of the world's output; the 118 lead mines, 73 zinc mines, the quicksilver, antimony, vanadium, bismuth, manganese, and graphite mines; and, lastly, the coal mines which open up an immense hitherto practically unworked industry.

Nor can I go into detail about the agricultural opportunities in Mexico, pronounced by experts to be almost unequalled in the world. Let it be remembered that the sisal and henequin industry of the world is centered in Yucatan; that the raising of cattle is unusually advantageous in Mexico; that a large proportion of the cigars sold as "Havanas" are made of Mexican tobacco; that the

Mexican plan of cultivation makes it possible to take off the land three crops of cereals a year; that the cotton, vegetable oils, and rubber industries have not nearly reached the zenith of their development; that, with the introduction of modern machinery, Mexico will become "an ideal sugar-producing country"; that about one-half of the mahogany consumed in the United States comes from Mexico; that Mexico abounds in building timber and cabinet woods; and that "the area of first-class timber in Mexico comprises, at a conservative estimate, from twenty to twenty-five million acres."

Oil

But however important may be the mines with their fabulous riches, the soil with its agricultural opportunities, and the forests with their untapped wealth, these do not furnish the primary reason for the ominous interest in Mexico on the part of American finance at this time. It is Mexican oil that is centering the world's attention upon our neighbor to the south.

"Today oil is king," commented the *New York Times* on September 14, 1919, in its leading editorial, "because it is supplanting coal as fuel in land and sea transportation, and its uses are manifold in industry and rapidly increasing. The nation without reservoirs of oil must falter in the competitive struggle."

And Edward L. Doheny, president of the Mexican Petroleum Company, in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Sub-Committee investigating the Mexican situation, on September 11, 1919, asserted:

"It is absolutely necessary, if our industrial and military position shall be sustained, that America adopt the policy of encouraging every interest reaching out for the control of oil fields wherever they may be. The merchant marine of the future will be driven by oil, for the oil-burning ships will drive coal burners out of business.

"Today it is calculated that we have 6,000,000 internal combustion engines working in this country, and within ten years we will have 15,000,000. That means we will require two and a half times as much oil as now, and that supply cannot be had within the United States.

"Where is it to be had? It is in Mexico."

The realization that oil is one of the most coveted commodities in the world today led the *Springfield Republican* last July to predict that Mexico would be penalized for possessing oil in much the same manner in which the Transvaal paid for having gold mines:

"In Mexico the valuable oil fields are the chief prize, for today oil is almost as precious as gold was twenty and twenty-five years ago. The world has entered upon the gasoline age. The search for fresh petroleum fields is being pressed in all parts of the earth, and a backward country like Mexico swept into this capitalistic whirlpool, is bound to have trouble exactly as the pastoral Boers did in old Paul Kruger's time, when Johannesburg and the Rand suddenly became the center of the gold-mining industry in a world financially starving for a broader gold basis for its circulating mediums."

American Investments

Let us first inquire for a moment into the extent of American investments in Mexico. It is impossible to obtain either accurate or up-to-date figures on this point. Accuracy is impossible because the term "capital investment" is differently interpreted by different concerns and under different circumstances. When it is a question of making declarations for taxation purposes, each investor places the value of his investment at the lowest possible figure. When damages are to be claimed, however, for losses sustained during the revolution, the figures soar! According to the figures furnished me by the Mexican Government's Financial Agency in New York, the actual American capital invested is close to \$400,000,000, while the present value of properties held by Americans is probably \$1,500,000,000.

Even as informative and up-to-date a publication as the *Latin-American Year Book* for 1919 fails to give recent figures. Its latest estimate is for the period 1892-1907! These figures can, obviously, serve no scientific purpose, and I shall therefore not even take the trouble to quote them.

The bulk of American investments is in railway properties, mining, land, industries (such as jute mills, electric light companies, and the packing industry), and especially oil.

Whatever may be the extent of American investments, it is not difficult to see that, in a country like the United States, the united protest against conditions in Mexico on the part of the American investors is likely to find ready response. This is but too well illustrated by the phenomenal success which the National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico has had in persuading the newspapers of this country to its point of view. This Association was formed last January in the offices of the Anaconda Copper Company in New York, and has on its executive committee such men as Edward L. Doheny of the Mexican Petroleum Company, Thomas W. Lamont of J. P. Morgan and Company, Charles H. Sabin, president of the Guaranty Trust Company of New York, several large corporation lawyers, and various other officials of oil, rubber, mining, land, and banking corporations.

What point of view is held by these directors is evident from the fact that this Association denounces Article XXVII of the Mexican Constitution (of which more anon) as "radical in the extreme," and that it has reprinted and circulated with evident approval the following editorial comment from the *Wilmington (Del.) paper*:

"To be compelled to thrash Mexico into submission by the full employment of our military and naval strength would be most regrettable, but it is difficult to see how such a course can be honorably avoided."

Mexico is committing the crime against "civilization" of making an honest effort to conserve for her own people those vast natural resources which have not yet been turned over to foreign exploiters, and to place upon foreign concessions such limitations as will contribute to the maintenance of law and order within her borders and reduce to a minimum the possibilities of international friction. Paradoxical as it may seem, her very attempt to eliminate a primary cause for war is proving one of the main factors in conjuring up the dreaded monster.

Mexican Struggle for Land

Throughout the ages, the struggle in Mexico has been like that of Russia, of Hungary, and of Ireland—a struggle of the masses for land and bread, a struggle of a submerged under-class against a small but powerful and prosperous upper crust, a struggle of the people against autocracy. Finally, in 1913, under the leadership of Francisco I. Madero, the revolution triumphed. Temporary setbacks could not stem its tide, and, by February, 1917, under the Presidency of Venustiano Carranza, a new Constitution was promulgated which in legal form gives expression to the soul of the revolution. No other section is so irksome a thorn in the flesh of American financial imperialists as is Article XXVII, which sets forth the conditions of ownership of lands and natural resources.

"The ownership of lands and waters comprised within the limits of the national territory is vested originally in the Nation," asserts Article XXVII in the opening sentence, "which has had, and has, the right to transmit title thereof to private persons, thereby constituting private property."

A little further on the article continues:

"The nation shall have at all times the right to impose on private property such limitations as the public interest may demand, as well as the right to regulate the development of natural resources."

During the Diaz régime practically no steps were taken to regulate the development of natural resources. The profits of foreign concessionaires were limitless. Since May, 1917, however, various regulations have been in effect, among them one imposing certain taxes on oil lands. The government practically said to the oil companies, "you who are clamoring for protection, cannot expect to have the Mexican government police your holdings without contributing to its support. Therefore, we shall charge you a certain rental and fix a certain tax which will flow into the national treasury and help toward the upkeep of government."

A protest went up from the oil group. "This is confiscation," they cried. Yet what are the facts? The Aguila Company, despite this "confiscatory" legislation, last year

declared a dividend of 25% on both common and preferred stock. The Doheny concern in 1918 was able to clear almost \$7,000,000 after paying \$2,000,000 in taxes to the Mexican and \$5,000,000 to the American government, and after deducting nearly \$4,000,000 for depreciation and \$5,000,000 for losses during the revolution.

Future Control of Resources

Continuing, the Constitution asserts:

"In the nation is vested direct ownership of all minerals or substances which in veins, layers, masses, or beds constitute deposits whose nature is different from the components of the land, such as . . . petroleum . . ."

This is indeed a blow to those who, with the *New York Evening Mail*, believe that "it is the pressing duty of American financial enterprise and American statesmanship to furnish to our future commerce the fuel of the future—the oil which other nations are making such energetic efforts to corner for their own use!" Here the Mexican people boldly assert that they intend in future to hold for themselves those untapped reservoirs of oil that, according to investigations by the Mexican Petroleum commission, constitute nine-tenths of the oil wealth of Mexico. No other section of Article XXVII is, I believe, as offensive as this to the petroleum kings. They cannot really find fault with the regulations governing their present holdings. In its desire to go to the utmost lengths for the sake of preserving peace, the Mexican government has again and again announced its willingness to have this section apply only to the future, and not to oil lands already under exploitation.

Another important section of Article XXVII is the following:

"Only Mexicans by birth or naturalization and Mexican companies have the right to acquire ownership in lands, waters and their appurtenances, or to obtain concessions to develop mines, waters or mineral fuels in the Republic of Mexico. The nation may grant the same right to foreigners, provided they agree before the Department of Foreign Affairs to be considered Mexicans in respect to such property, and ac-

cordingly not to invoke the protection of their governments in respect to the same."

How Friction May Be Stirred Up

How often have wars been conjured up in the past by the simple device of having some exploiter get into trouble in some weaker country, and then having him return to his native land with stories of the barbarity of the weaker country and the emphatic demand that a cleaning-up take place! A handful of American investors in Mexico finds it easy to hold the center of the American newspaper stage with charges of the insecurity of life south of the Rio Grande (during eight years of revolution and reconstruction 217 Americans lost their lives down there, partly through their own fault—compare that figure with the lynching, during the same period, of 469 American negroes!) while the outrages visited upon the workers at Bisbee, Butte, Bogalusa, Paterson, McKeesport, Pittsburgh, Lawrence, and other industrial centers pass almost unmentioned.

By way of further reducing the possibilities of international friction, the Mexicans have inserted this clause in their new constitution:

"Within a zone of 100 kilometers (ca. 60 miles) from the frontiers, and of 50 kilometers from the sea coast, no foreigner shall under any conditions acquire direct ownership of lands and waters."

Anyone familiar with the history of "raids" by Mexican bandits knows that these raids usually take place along the border and that they are just as often as not staged by American enterprise in order to stir up feeling against the Mexicans. Lieut. Col. Reginald L. Porter of the New York National Guards, on returning from border duty following the "Columbus Raid" ventured the following opinion on the subject of raids. (*New York World*, December 31, 1916.):

"The stock term by which some of the franker inhabitants refer to what is bulletined out of Texas as 'Another border atrocity' is 'Moving Picture Raid.'

"You can buy a raid right down here in the village for fifty dollars and ammunition; and for seventy-five dollars you can get a first-class one."

Present Status of Socialism in America

Three Party Conventions

Harry W. Laidler

In late August several hundred delegates journeyed to Chicago, each in his own way to save the revolutionary movement of the workers from destruction. The Socialist Party Executive had hired Mechanics Hall, near the fine new home of the party, as the meeting place for the convention. The convention hall was one flight up. The Left Wingers had rented the lower floor for caucus purposes. The convention was scheduled to begin on Saturday morning, August 30th. Rumor had it that the left wingers had planned to rush the hall. Though these rumors were widespread, no member of the "old guard" had been assigned to the task of guarding the hall against intruders, and, shortly after nine A. M., a number of delegates, contested delegates and visitors, chiefly of left wing proclivities, sauntered into the rooms and began to occupy seats reserved for uncontested delegates. News of this reached the office of the party. When a number of party officials arrived on the scene, they found John Reed mounting the stairs and calling to his followers to rush the hall. A scuffle ensued between Reed and Germer of New York. The police interfered and ordered the insurgents down the stairs. Germer asked everyone to leave the hall. Many refused. Again the police interfered, and the hall was cleared. Henceforth only those holding delegate cards, countersigned by Executive Secretary Germer, were admitted to delegates' seats. Others, of course, were privileged to sit in the "visitors' gallery" during the sessions.

This fracas and particularly the fact that the police had to interfere before members of the left wing could be induced to leave the hall was used with marked effect, especially when imagination began to take wing, as proof positive that the old party had become a "counter-revolutionary" organization. Unhappily Chairman Stedman, during a discussion in the convention hall, declared jokingly

that "of course it is thoroughly understood that the police of Chicago will obey any orders that we give them!" This gentle irony was taken in deep earnest by the bolters, and, at the beginning of the Communist Labor Party convention, Katterfeld of Kansas declared that a party whose spokesman could make such a remark had surely descended to the depths.

The Bolt Occurs

The Socialist Party convention was opened by Adolph Germer, the big-framed miner and "arch counter-revolutionist," whose activities the government had rewarded by a twenty-year sentence—strangely enough the one executive secretary of the three conventions who looked the part of a member of the proletariat. Nearly 150 uncontested delegates from 25 states and the D. of C. were seated. Downstairs left wingers, Communist Party adherents, and anti-machine socialists remained to persuade each other of the path he should follow. On the first show of strength between the left wingers and the remainder of the party, Seymour Stedman was elected chairman of the day against J. M. Coldwell of Rhode Island, the leader of the insurgents, by a vote of 88 to 37. The next struggle took place over the committee on contests. Here again the regulars were elected. The following three days were largely absorbed in vigorous debate over the admission of contested delegates. About a dozen were admitted and 17 were excluded.¹

¹ Six delegates were seated from California, two from Nebraska, two from Utah, one from Pennsylvania, one from New Jersey, and Ludwig Lore from the German federations. Of these, the California delegation, three of the four delegates from Oregon and two from Utah refused to take their seats.

The convention failed to seat the five delegates from Washington and seven from Minnesota. Both delegations admitted that they had permitted the suspended language federations to vote in the convention elections, and that they in-

On Sunday afternoon, before the contests had been disposed of, and on motion to read, but not to act upon the report of the National Executive Committee, J. M. Coldwell of Rhode Island announced the withdrawal of all left wing delegates. A few withdrew in a manner devoid, alas, of anything spectacular. By Sunday night, of the 146 delegates originally seated as uncontested, 26 had left the convention.²

The business of the convention from then on moved forward steadily and with comparative smoothness. Numerous delegates remained who in general took the left wing position, notably William Kruse, J. Louis Engdahl of Illinois, Rose Weiss of New Jersey, and Fred B. Chase of New Hampshire. Throughout the proceedings of the succeeding days, the delegates on the whole expressed their pride in the fact that the resolutions passed by the delegates were far in advance of those held at any previous convention.

tended either to refuse seats in the convention or later to bolt. The Washington organization had indorsed the left wing, "a rival and separate political organization." Two delegates from Iowa and Wyoming were refused seats on the ground that they had not been members of the party for three years—a ruling of the constitution—and one from Florida, on the ground that he was not a resident of the state. William Bross Lloyd and L. E. Katterfeld were excluded because of their connection with the left wing, their interference with the collection of convention stamps, thus endangering "the orderly processes of the activities of the Socialist Party." Thus fourteen were excluded for their activities in connection with the left wing organization, or their recognition of suspended federations; three for more technical violations of the constitution. The Ohio delegation refused to make a contest.

²These included: the entire delegations of Arkansas (2); Colorado (2); Delaware (1); Kentucky (2); Rhode Island (2); Texas (1); West Virginia (1)—states in which the socialist movement was in general weak; and portions of the delegations in Illinois (9 out of 20); Indiana (3 out of 6); Kansas (1 out of 2); New Jersey (2 out of 8). The Indiana delegates and a few of the others afterwards withdrew from the Communist Labor Party Convention. Illinois was the one state with a large delegation that was materially affected. The 32 delegates from New York, the 16 from Pennsylvania, the 11 from Wisconsin, the 10 from the reorganized state of Massachusetts, the 6 from Oklahoma, and the smaller delegations from Connecticut, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Michigan (reorganized), Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, and Wyoming, and the District of Columbia remained unaffected.

The Birth of the Communist Labor Party

On Sunday evening, August 31, in the downstairs billiard room, the seceding delegates, after many informal conferences, gathered together for the singing of the Internationale, and were called to order by Alfred Wagenknecht, "on behalf of the newly elected Executive Committee of the Socialist Party."³ To the outsider, the well-groomed presiding officer, Margaret Prevey of Ohio, the shirt-sleeved figure of "the millionaire communist," William Bross Lloyd—the sergent-at-arms—and the sprinkling of dentists, doctors, writers, and professional agitators would hardly have suggested the birth of a new revolutionary mass movement of the proletariat.

The first explosion of the convention occurred when C. E. Ruthenberg moved that the first order of business be the consideration of unity with the Communist Party. Until one in the morning those present fought over this motion. Reed contended that the Communist Party should send a committee to his group. Boudin maintained that leading members of the Communist Party had sabotaged every revolutionary movement in the past, and that that party was merely another sect, another church.

The convention finally appointed a committee to confer with the Communist Party. The committee's labors, however, were doomed

³Present, when the roll was called and the convention informally organized, were the 26 delegates who left their seats in the Socialist Party convention; the Ohio delegation who refused to contest their seats—Ruthenberg, its strongest member, soon resigned to attend the Communist Party; the Minnesota group, of which all but Jack Carney left to join with the Communists; the delegates from the Pacific Coast; a miscellaneous group of ten from New York, and scattering delegates—some of whose mandates were not particularly clear—from other states.

In all, between eighty and ninety passed the muster of the credentials committee. These, according to the secretary, represented nearly 30,000 members; according to the Communist Party, at most scarcely 10,000. The Ohio delegation, led by Wagenknecht and Margaret Prevey; the Illinois delegation, with William Bross Lloyd, Edgar Owens, and Dr. Sandberg; and the New York group with the volatile and picturesque figures—John Reed, Benjamin Gitlow, and Edward Lindgren—were prominent forces in this gathering.

to failure. By Tuesday morning, September 2, when the delegates were assured that co-operation with the Communist Party was impossible, they definitely organized a separate group known as the Communist Labor Party of America.

The chief debate of this convention centered around the report of the platform committee. Every plank proposed was passed with little comment until the sixth was reached. This plank urged the workers to join with the Communist Labor Party on the political field.

"On the political field" proved a red rag to John Reed. The main drive, he maintained, should be made on the industrial field. Laws when passed were not enforced. The workers should be taught direct action. Legislative reforms, by making the condition of the workers more tolerable, postponed the revolution. So the speaker introduced an amendment that the Communist Labor Party urge the workers to unite "for the conquest of political power to establish a government adapted to the communist transformation." No means whereby this conquest was to be made were suggested.

Lindgren strongly favored this amendment, contended that parliamentary action was futile, and declared that those still believing in its effectiveness should return to the Socialist Party. Their place was not with the Communist Labor Party. Others maintained that candidates should not be elected for the purpose of gaining legislative reforms, but in order to agitate more effectively for the revolution.

J. M. Coldwell, on the other hand, declared that, if he ever reached the conclusion that nothing could be accomplished through parliamentary action, he would do the sensible thing—resign from a political organization and join the I. W. W.

The industrial actionists won. By a vote of 41 to 28 they defeated a substitute which called on the workers to make the Communist Labor Party "their political expression in their struggle for the control of the powers

of government," and passed the Reed amendment by a two to one vote (46 to 22). Following the announcement of this vote—a virtual repudiation of parliamentary action—Louis Boudin of New York darted for his hat and cane and bolted the convention, declaring that he had not "left a party of crooks to join a party of lunatics." Several others followed suit.

The convention approved the principles of the Third International, and advocated the usual program of social ownership of industry. In the program formulated by Reed and others, it declared that the Communists could urge only one demand, "the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat." It deprecated social reforms. It favored mass action in the shop as the most important means of capturing the state power. It asserted that "not one of the great teachers of scientific Socialism has ever said that it is possible to achieve the social revolution by the ballot." It also urged organized propagation of industrial unionism and suggested the development of labor organizations along the lines of the shop steward and shop committee movements.⁴

The Communists

On September 1, the morning after the Communist Labor Party had appointed its first committee to confer with the Communist Party, "in order that the forces of revolutionary communism might present a solid front against the capitalism and Scheidemanns inside of the socialist movement," the much hailed Communist Party opened its first convention at "Smolny Institute," Chicago. It was called to order at 12:30. Earlier in the day the ceiling had been covered with red bunting, in honor of the occasion, and the walls decorated with big posters inscribed with "Long Live the Dictatorship of the

⁴During the last hours of the convention, after a large proportion of the delegates had gone to their respective homes, an executive committee of five was elected—Bedacht of California, Bilan of Ohio, Carney of Minnesota, Katterfeld of Kansas, and Lindgren of New York. Wagenknecht was elected executive secretary, Reed and Wagenknecht international delegates. Cleveland was designated as the party headquarters.

Proletariat," "Long Live the Third International of Moscow." The Department of Justice did not like the looks of these signs and the police, all that morning, had supervised the tearing down of every bit of red! The portraits of Lenin, Trotzky, Gorki, and Marx, however, were allowed to remain.

The convention was easily distinguishable by its youth from that of the other two. The majority of delegates seemed to be still in their twenties. This was the first National Convention that most of them had attended, and each and every one had an unshakable conviction that he was destined to play a rôle of no small importance in the American labor movement. "Fraina," said one of them rather maliciously, "credits Lenin with being the Fraina of Russia."

The convention was distinguished by the smoothness with which its machinery worked. Many in the Communist Labor Party had bitterly complained of "machine" politics in the Socialist Party. But, alas, when some of these same delegates applied for admission in the Communist Party, and had felt the beautifully oiled steam roller of the Russian Federation pass over them, they began to lose what respect they formerly possessed for the cumbersome machine of the Socialist Party. Machine politics? No. The unit rule in the Communist Party was not machine politics, it was nothing more nor less than "revolutionary discipline"!

The convention differed from the other gatherings in still another respect—in the development therein of a new terminology. For years the words "class struggle," "economic determinism," "surplus value," "coöperative commonwealth," were bandied back and forth at socialist gatherings and many were constantly urging the socialists to keep the substance of their program, but to adopt a terminology more intelligible to the mass of the workers. During the last few years the party had been inclined to reconstruct its terminology, and the party conferences had begun to take on less the character of a sect, more that of an integral part of American life.

At the Communist Party convention, the old Marxian terminology was indeed partly discarded, but with monotonous regularity one heard the oft-repeated phrases of the new movement—"revolutionary communism," "revolutionary discipline," "dictatorship of the proletariat," "centrist," "counter-revolutionist," "Bolshevik tactics," "revolutionary mass action," "revolutionary upsurge of the mass," *ad infinitum*.

And after the long sessions of involved discussions as to what Lenin and Trotzky and their followers would do under similar circumstances, the visitor would not have felt at all surprised if, on leaving the close atmosphere of the hall, he had suddenly found himself walking the streets of Petrograd, and stumbling across the great Russian revolutionary leaders themselves. Indeed it was much more of a shock to step into the street and to find that one was still in the city of the Red Sox—a city almost totally oblivious, so it seemed on the surface, to the rumblings of the revolution that appeared so near to the comrades in "Smolny."

The officials listed, following the organization of the party, some 130 delegates.⁵ About one-third of the delegates were elected by the language federations, though the large majority of them either belonged to or were eligible for membership in these federations.

The C. P. and the C. L. P.

The first evening witnessed one of the bitterest fights of the convention—the fight over the relation of the Communist Party with the Communist Labor Party. I. E. Ferguson introduced a resolution to appoint a committee of five to confer with the C. L. P. Committee. The resolution brought Nicholas

⁵Some of these afterwards withdrew, while a few others were added. These came from federations and locals of 16 states, and represented a constituency variously estimated at from thirty to fifty thousand. Eighty-nine of these were present from the states of New York (33), Illinois (18), Michigan (15), and Massachusetts (11), Pennsylvania (12)—three Eastern and two Middle Western states. Only two delegates were listed from the strong Socialist state of Wisconsin. Other states represented were: California (2), Connecticut (6), Indiana (7), Kansas (1), Maryland (1), Minnesota (6), New Jersey (7), Rhode Island (2), Ohio (6), and Washington (1).

Hourwich, one of the leaders of the Russian group, to his feet.

"Those elements in the left wing convention," he declared, "did not know where to go, so they went to the emergency convention and finally had to bolt. They are the real center of the socialist movement. We cannot enter into negotiations with them as a whole. We do not know whom they represent. The only body authorized to deal with them is the credentials committee. They must be punished for their tactics."

"The centrists would come to us," declared Lounin, "to capture the Communist Party. We have enough centrists now. You cannot become a Bolshevik in a day."

Max Cohen, from one of the English-speaking branches in New York, on the other hand, in favoring the Ferguson resolution, took the position that the best Bolshevik tactics was to split the centrist leaders away from the communist elements in the revolutionary mass. He declared that there could be no question of amalgamation between the two bodies. John J. Ballam of Massachusetts said that he preferred to follow the Menshevik right of the Communist Party to "those wind-crazed radicals" (referring to some of the Russian delegates). Louis Fraina also contended for the Ferguson motion.

Ferguson wound up the discussion:

"Are you afraid of losing control of the convention?" he asked the Russians. "I do not want you to lose control. Your control will assure the teaching of the principles of communism. Are you going to keep up a compromise with the Michigan group in order to keep control? Are you tricking us until you get a nicely organized caucus with a unit rule to put it over us?"

Following the discussion, the three score delegates from the Russian and Michigan groups voted almost to a man against the appointment of a committee, and the Ferguson motion was defeated by a vote of 75 to 31. The vote, however, did not end the trouble. The next morning, the English-speaking minority met, decided that the Russian Federations had carried their "revolutionary discipline" too far, and, by resigning as a group from various committees, forced a reconsideration of the question.

A conference committee was finally appointed. The two committees met. The

Communist Party asserted that it "would gain nothing through additional membership unless the membership was clearly communist." It would welcome any delegate who would prove individually to the credentials committee that he was a revolutionary communist, but it would not permit the Communist Labor Party group to enter the sacred confines of the Communist Party on equal terms.

The Communist Labor Party replied that there were also inconsistent elements in the ranks of the Communist Party and that it was a case of the pot calling the kettle black. The Michigan group had been invited into the Communist Party by the Russian Federation, "not upon principle, but for political expediency." The Communist Party contained the "centrists" who had violated their mandates from the left wing convention.

In the final reply, the Communist Party declared that there could be no charge of inconsistent elements if "the work of our convention shows agreement on communist fundamentals. . . . We appeal to your delegates to act on their individual judgment, not in a false sense of loyalty to an accidental grouping in a body which represents no membership organization." A further unavailing effort toward unity was made, and, on September 6, a standing invitation was sent to the Communist Party "to meet on a basis of equality in a Unity Conference," the manifesto declaring that there was no fundamental difference in principle between the two groups.

"Parasites" and Politics

Having largely disposed of the annoying problem of unity which threatened for a while to take control out of the hands of the language federations, the party gave its attention to the platform and constitution. The constitution was, in the nature of the case, strikingly different from any document of a political party ever formulated in this country. One provision read: "No person who has an entire livelihood from rent, interest, or

profit shall be eligible to membership in the Communist Party."

It looked for some time as if this provision would exclude Rose Pastor Stokes from membership. She, however, convinced the delegates that she was occasionally exploited by her publishers and was permitted to remain! Later she became one of the convention's sergeants-at-arms.

With one fell swoop magazine writers who contributed articles to non-communist journals (save only "scientific" or "professional" journals) were excluded from community with the comrades of the Communist Party. The delegates favored centralized control, the limited use of referenda, and strict discipline and the party manifesto followed faithfully along the lines of the Moscow International and the Left Wing Manifesto.⁶

Scorning parliamentary action as it is generally understood, the convention laid its chief emphasis on industrial movements. It declared that the Communist Party should make big industrial struggles its major campaigns; that it should participate in mass strikes, as a step toward a *general mass strike*, and that each local should get into contact with the workers of the shops, organize shop committees wherever possible, assist in revo-

⁶The party program stated its opposition to parliamentary action with more definiteness than did the Communist Labor Party. It read:

"Participation in parliamentary campaigns which in the general struggle of the proletariat is of secondary importance, is for the purpose of revolutionary propaganda only.

"Parliamentary representatives of the Communist Party shall not introduce or support reform measures. Parliaments and political democracy shall be utilized to assist in organizing the working class against capitalism and the state. Parliamentary representatives shall consistently expose the oppressive class character of the capitalist state, using the legislative forum to interpret and emphasize the class struggle; they shall make clear how parliamentarism and parliamentary democracy deceive the workers; and they shall analyze capitalist legislative proposals and reform palliatives as evasions of the issue and as of no fundamental significance to the working class."

"Nominations for public office and participation in elections are limited to legislative bodies only, such as municipal councils, state legislature, and national Congress."

This provision would preclude the party from nominating candidates for President, Governor, Mayor, or any other executive position.

lutionizing trade unions, and agitate for the construction of a general industrial trade union.

It was in the discussion of platform and program that the rupture between the Michigan "peculiarity," as it was called, and the rest of the party became clear. The Michigan group gave a minority report which differed little from the general run of socialist platforms during the last decade except that it eliminated immediate demands, a program, complained Ferguson of the majority, "of pure parliamentarism with a prophecy that when the work of education shall have advanced far enough other tactics may be used. It makes reference to proletarian dictatorship, but with no acceptance of the process by which this dictatorship must be acquired."

The minority program of the "Mensheviks," who believed in the dictatorship by the majority, as contrasted with the militant minority of the proletariat, was hopelessly defeated. The twenty Michigan stalwarts thereupon publicly stated their disapproval of the manifesto and program adopted by the convention and "of the methods used in forcing its adoption." They refused to vote on the adoption or to take any part in the election of officers. They did not bolt the convention, but the chances of their continued support of the Communist Party seemed slight.

The Socialist Party Manifesto

In the meanwhile, purged of certain left wing elements, the Socialist Party, with its Wisconsin delegation on the extreme right, its Kruse-Engdahl-Weiss-Chase group on the left, and its mass of delegates in the center, hammered out a more consistently radical program than it had ever before attempted.

Throughout—despite many disagreements vigorously expressed—once rid of the seceders, the convention was characterized by good-will and by a feeling of work well done. It reached the highest pitch of enthusiasm on the reading of its stirring manifesto which it passed without a dissenting vote. "Hillquit sick," declared one of the

delegates after listening to the manifesto largely the work of the Eastern leader, "is worth all of the rest of us well."⁷

Parliamentary Action

The party distinguished itself from the Communist and Communist Labor Parties by its insistence on parliamentary action as one of the means of bringing about a coöperative system. Political action within the meaning of the constitution it defined in the constitution sent out for referendum vote as "participation in elections for public offices and practical legislation and administration work along the line of the Socialist Party platform to gain control of the powers of the government in order to abolish the present capitalist system and the substitution of the coöperative commonwealth."

By way of emphasizing that the party was a political organization and interested in its

job of electing workers to office, delegates decided to urge an amendment to the constitution, exacting of every prospective member who was not naturalized a promise that he would make application for his citizens papers, wherever possible, within 90 days of application.

At the same time the party by no means ignored industrial action. In fact, maintaining that its chief function as a party was that of "wresting the political machinery from the hands of the ruling class," it deemed it its "paramount duty" to point out that "industrial organization must take the place of the craft union." It likewise appointed a committee on industrial organization to assist in strengthening organized labor in every way. The party took another distinct step toward the soviet idea in its resolution on industrial representation in which it fa-

"The manifesto, which touched on the peace, the League of Nations, the workers' international, and other problems, read in part as follows:

"It was the world-wide struggle between the working class and the capitalist class which dictated the decisions of the Versailles Conference. This is clearly shown on the one hand by the desperate attempts to crush Soviet Russia and by the destruction of Socialist Finland and Soviet Hungary, and on the other hand by its recognition of the unsocialistic coalition government of Germany.

"The so-called League of Nations is the Capitalist Black International against the rise of the working class. It is the conscious alliance of the capitalists of all nations against the workers of all nations. . . .

"Recognizing the crucial situation at home and abroad, the Socialist Party of the United States, at its first national convention after the war, squarely takes its position with the uncompromising section of the international socialist movement. We unreservedly reject the policy of those socialists who supported their belligerent capitalist governments on the plea of 'national defense' and who entered into demoralizing compacts for so-called civil peace with the exploiters of labor during the war and continued a political alliance with them after the war. We, the organized socialists of America, pledge our support to the revolutionary workers of Russia in the support of their Soviet Government; to the radical socialists of Germany, Austria, and Hungary in their efforts to establish working-class rule in their countries, and to those socialist organizations in England, France, Italy, and other countries who, during the war, as after the war, have remained true to the principles of uncompromising international socialism.

"We are utterly opposed to the so-called League of Nations. Against this international alliance

of capitalist governments, we hold out to the world the ideal of a federation of free and equal socialist nations.

"A genuine and lasting peace can be built only upon the basis of reconciliation among the peoples of the warring nations and their mutual coöperation in the task of reconstructing the shattered world.

"We emphatically protest against all military, material, or moral support which our government is extending to Czarist counter-revolutionists in Russia and the reactionary forces in Hungary, and we demand the immediate lifting of the indefensible and inhuman blockade of Soviet Russia.

"We demand the unconditional and immediate liberation of all political and industrial class war prisoners convicted under the infamous Espionage Law and other repressive legislation. We demand the immediate and unconditional release of all conscientious objectors. We demand the full restoration to the American people of their constitutional rights and liberties. . . .

"The great purpose of the Socialist Party is to wrest the industries and the control of the government of the United States from the capitalists and their retainers. It is our purpose to place industry and government in the control of the workers with hand or brain, to be administered for the benefit of the whole community.

"To insure the triumph of socialism in the United States, the bulk of the American workers must be strongly organized politically as socialists in constant, clear-cut, and aggressive opposition to all parties of the possessing class. They must be organized on the economic field on broad industrial lines, as one powerful and harmonious class organization, coöperating with the Socialist Party, and ready in cases of emergency to reinforce the political demands of the working class by industrial action."

vored "a system based on occupational groups," and decided to agitate for constitutional amendments to effect such representation.

The Election of the Party Executive

One question that would not down at the convention was: "Why did the old Executive Committee refuse to recognize the spring elections to the Executive Committee?" The old Executive tried to answer that question. The face of the ballots, the committee admitted, indicated the election of a majority of left wing candidates. Before the returns were counted, however, many complaints of election irregularities, particularly in certain language federations, had been made to the committee. An investigation was started. Language federations were asked to submit the original ballots to the national office for inspection. A small minority returned the ballots. These ballots were inspected. They showed, according to the Committee, marked irregularities.⁸

The convention concurred in the action of the old Executive in refusing to recognize the newly elected Committee, as well as in its expulsions and suspensions. The delegates maintained, however, that, had the N. E. C. made a sufficient effort to acquaint the membership of the suspended and expelled organizations with the facts, many of the members now outside of the party might have remained in the fold. Unofficially, it was

⁸ The Committee alleged: 1. That in certain branches of the Russian and other federations the members signed their names to ballots previously marked by the secretary or some other person.

2. That in a number of instances ballots were marked to indicate how the members should vote.

3. That some branches reported a full vote for the left wing when votes had been cast for other candidates.

4. That a large number of branches of suspended federations cast an absolutely uniform vote.

5. Finally, that a large number of branches cast more votes than their average membership for the preceding four months. It was reasonable to suppose, the committee reported, that greater irregularities existed in branches which had refused to furnish ballots as requested to the Executive Committee. It was obviously impossible to show who would have been elected if the irregularities had not occurred.

agreed that few if any of the old Executive should be reelected at the convention.

Coöperation Favored

In the last days delegates passed many trenchant resolutions. They placed the party solidly back of the coöperative movement, which they declared had raised the standard of living among the workers, had assisted strikers during industrial disputes, had given to the workers a valuable training in industry, and had sustained the Russian revolution. The convention urged that coöperative societies be organized in the United States whenever the possibilities of success were reasonably assured. The party should publish literature on the subject, and socialist speakers should explain to the comrades the importance of the movement.

The delegates pledged their support to the workers of Ireland "in their effort for complete separation and freedom from the British Empire," and demanded "that the government of the United States at once recognize unconditionally the Irish Republic." They protested against the deportation of British India's "apostles of freedom"; demanded that "India be recognized as an independent, self-ruling people"; denounced the mob violence against the negro workers, asserting that socialism would eliminate race prejudice; reaffirmed their faith in the innocence of Mooney and Billings, "victims of the class war," asking for them an immediate and fair retrial or an immediate and unconditional release; urged the immediate seating of Victor L. Berger; registered their opposition to universal military 'training; denounced the Jewish pogroms; protested against Mexican intervention; condemned the deportation of workers, and demanded the immediate repeal of the Espionage Law.

Another resolution dealt with the Plumb plan which the delegates felt was a step in the right direction. Still another urged closer relations between the socialists of North and South America.

The International

As was inevitable, a cleavage of opinion oc-

curred over the question of affiliation with the Third International. The majority report on this subject repudiated the Berne Conference as "retrograde," and favored the reconstitution of the International, asserting that, in this new group, "only such organizations and parties should be given representation which declare their strict adherence by word and deed to the principle of the class struggle." The minority report definitely urged affiliation with the Third International. Both reports were submitted to referendum vote of the membership.

Debs

Throughout the convention the central figure—though absent—was that of the gaunt idealist who had been the chief standard bearer of the socialist hosts in this country since 1900, and who was serving a ten-year sentence in Atlanta penitentiary—Eugene V. Debs. Practically every delegate present agreed that Debs should be the party's standard bearer in the 1920 campaign. Many wished to nominate him immediately. Others advised delay—an official nomination might prevent his speedy release. Furthermore delegates had received no instructions to choose a presidential candidate. The convention, therefore, contented itself with resolving "that it is the sense of this conven-

tion that we go on record as favoring the nomination of Eugene V. Debs as the presidential candidate of the Socialist Party in the campaign of 1920, but that we refer the actual nomination of presidential and vice-presidential candidates to the national convention of 1920."

Sunday night witnessed the end of these three historic conventions. For many of the delegates to the Communist and Communist Labor Parties, who scorned parliamentary action, and who placed almost exclusive reliance on mass action in the industrial field, the close of this convention proved but the beginning of bitter governmental prosecution. The reception thus far accorded these parties leads the student to ask: Can a party which repudiates parliamentary action hope to become an effective political organization in the United States?

The 126,000 votes received by the Socialist ticket in New York in the November elections and the steady increase in Socialist Party membership seem to indicate, on the other hand, that the schism has not taken the old organization out of American politics. In fact many there are who contend that the Socialist Party is in a much more strategic position than ever before in its history to reach the average American worker with its message of industrial democracy.

South American Notes

Marion G. Eaton

South American countries are beginning to realize, with the rest of the world, the unsatisfactory conditions under which the majority of their citizens live and work. Brazil alone was actively engaged in the Great War, but the difficulties of transportation and the general unsettlement of the world's trade consequent upon this conflict, meant for the whole continent not only a greatly increased cost of living, but a lack of many actual necessities. In addition a depreciated currency meant a lessened purchasing power of wages.

Statistics on labor unions and membership in socialist locals, or surveys of living condi-

tions are as yet scanty and unreliable. But it is possible to point out in all the important countries certain significant events indicating a sympathy with the world-wide unrest in laboring circles.

Argentina and the Buenos Aires port-workers' strikes have achieved the front pages of newspapers everywhere, but the ramifications of labor unrest into every corner of Argentine industry are not so well known.

The Argentine General Strike

During the winter of 1918 the railway workers of the Argentine declared a general

strike that really paralyzed transportation throughout the country and was marked by great disorder. Trains were wrecked, carloads of cereals were burned, and terminals were set on fire. The strike was promptly laid to German plotting against the grain supplies of the Allies. But it dragged on into the summer and was only settled by the insistence on the part of the government that the railroads which are owned by foreign capital grant the demands of the strikers for wages and working conditions equal to those conceded on the government railways.

All through the summer and fall of 1918, Argentine papers and letters from business houses predicted ominous future conditions. In the late fall or early winter the workmen of Vasena and Co., a steel company, the stock of which is largely held in England and which is controlled by directors living in London, went on strike, though the company continued to operate with strikebreakers for several weeks. On Tuesday, January 7, 1919, a general strike of organized labor was called throughout the nation. The following account of the effects of this strike in Buenos Aires is taken from the weekly letter of a New York corporation's representative. It was written as a matter-of-fact description of daily happenings and is quoted verbatim:

"As Monday the 6th inst. was a holiday and the general strike for the entire republic was called on Tuesday there has been no business this week. At the present writing, armed police and firemen are patrolling the city and troops are arriving, as the situation is very serious, what newspapers that have been published placing the killed around 4,000 and the wounded about 7,000. If there is an error in these reports it is on the low side, as the street fighting has been considerable, all businesses closed, no trains, trams, taxis, or other wheeled traffic moving, and the city at a standstill. Several police stations have been attacked, while the attack on the Central Police Station was more in the nature of a battle. At the present time the streets are in bad condition, what with the dead bodies of men and horses, partially burned tram cars, and the overturned refuse and garbage tins. It is interesting in passing to note that even since Tuesday the only papers published and sold on the streets were the two German morning papers and the one German evening paper.

"As all traffic is halted, people find it impossible to reach business, and the great majority of business places have been closed, some few that remained open until Thursday having the windows shattered in spite of the metal blinds used here. The city is without food and has been existing several days on tinned provisions.

"The metal industries are paralyzed, as the entire strike hinged on Vasena's trouble with their workmen, who have been out for several months, although they have been operating with strikebreakers. The other metal industries have now gone out in sympathy and several battles have taken place around the Vasena works, the streets having been torn up to form barricades and trenches for the strikers."

The foregoing letter was dated January 11, 1919, and went on to predict that this strike was really a revolution, but that it would be readily put down as soon as the government showed some force.

As a matter of fact by January 18 the demands of the steel workers had been granted and by the first of February business was returning to normal. Trouble in the Vasena works still continued, however, and there was frequent fighting in the surrounding streets. As these works failed to receive governmental protection, an order was finally issued from London that they be closed down. The management at that time announced that, "although granting all the strikers' demands in January, the arrangement was so greatly in favor of the workers that additional trouble was expected and has now arrived."

The port workers remained on strike, and insisted on their right to refuse to unload the goods for recalcitrant business houses. By the middle of March 100 ships were tied up in the harbor and the roadstead and shipping was beginning to go to other Argentine ports and even to Montevideo to unload. The loss in customs dues was seriously felt by the government, which now declared the port "nationalized" and ordered the strikers to return to work, promising to pay them out of government funds for the period of the strike. Unloading still proceeded in an uncertain manner. Foreign shippers were beginning to refuse to ship to Buenos Aires and it was early summer before the port business approached anything like normal.

From the first of March to the first of October all sorts and conditions of laborers went out on strike in defence of this principle of boycotting those business houses whose employees were striking. The telephone operators left work in March and again in June. Department store and bank employees struck in April and May. About the first of June typesetters refused to set advertisements from the stores in which the workers were on strike and the publishers shut down shop. As a consequence, no newspapers were published for two weeks. The workers on the trollies, which had been practically tied up all spring, soon left their jobs, followed by the taxi drivers and the hackmen. When Don Humberto Vasena of the Vasena Steel Co. landed in Buenos Aires the first week in May and went to the Plaza Hotel, all the employees refused to wait on him and the management was compelled to ask him to leave in order to avoid a walkout. In September the student body of every university in the country struck in sympathy with the students of one university who were protesting against the dismissal of two professors for political reasons.

At present writing, October 1, conditions in Buenos Aires are reported as normal again, with the customs dues exceeding those of the same period last year. Stringent regulations have been passed against the admission of foreigners. These must now be possessed of all sorts of passports and guarantees of good conduct before they are permitted to enter the country. The Employers' Association is united against organized labor and threatens to declare a lockout at the first hint of a strike. But the labor unions have learned their power and will probably use it in an increasingly effective manner.

Political Action

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of the labor troubles in Argentina is the manner in which the voters have supported the radical political parties. The so-called "radical" party has dominated Argentine politics for several years. In October, 1918, when the memory of the railroad strike was still fresh,

out of thirty seats in the Municipal Council of Buenos Aires, twelve went to the three socialist parties and ten to the radicals. At the federal elections in March, 1919, in the midst of the port strike, with seventy-three per cent. of the electorate, or 154,462 of the citizens voting, the radicals polled 50,843 votes for senator and the socialists 48,078. For two deputies the socialists polled 56,418 votes and the radicals 54,749. Until the close of the elections, the government made no effectual attempt to check the strike and no effort to deport "alien agitators."

Labor and Socialism in Uruguay.

Uruguay has a much stronger government than most of the South American countries and has come through the war with her exchange unimpaired. This condition of course makes for more prosperous and less unsettled conditions. The Socialist Party is fairly well organized and there is a flourishing local in Montevideo. Two socialists sit in the national legislature. This spring Montevideo was chosen for a Pan-American labor and socialist convention which was well attended and given every courtesy by the government.

In the summer of 1918 a general strike was called at the time of the Argentine railroad strikes which was accompanied in Montevideo by some rioting and bloodshed. Even the nurses in the hospitals threatened to walk out for a twenty-five per cent. increase in wages. But a forty-eight hour week for labor has been decreed throughout the republic and some degree of social insurance has been provided. An active Bureau of Labor is being developed under the new constitution which went into effect in March.

Some sporadic attempts were made through the spring and summer to call strikes either in sympathy with the Argentine strikers or as a protest against local conditions. But there has been no serious rioting and the situation has been wisely handled by a government that recognizes the real needs of the nation.

Backward Brazil

In Brazil an organized socialist movement does not date back more than a couple of

years and is largely under the direction of foreigners, both Germans and Portuguese, who entered during the war. Brazil also has prospered throughout the war and is being forced to build up home industries. Unemployment has thus been small, despite the lack of transportation for the export of foodstuffs on which Brazil depended before the war. Her list of exports has also increased greatly, so that a bad coffee year no longer completely upsets her economic life. A national labor bureau was established last winter and a workmen's compensation law passed.

Labor is gradually being organized, but the country is large and communication between the different states often difficult, so that such a general strike as that in Argentina is quite impossible. During the spring several strikes occurred in the big cities, notably in Sao Paulo, which started with the dock workers and spread to all labor. Demands were usually made for the eight-hour day. Finally the President of the Republic met a delegation of the Rio strikers and promised to initiate legislation to meet their demands. In August a strike of dock workers in Pernambuco spread to the electrical workers and completely tied up the light, power, and tramway services of the city. This strike was accompanied by some rioting and many cars were wrecked and burned. The English company which owned the works was finally forced to arbitrate and grant practically all of the demands of the men.

A Chilean Protest Strike

Chile, lying across the mountains from Argentina, has a well organized and powerful Socialist Party which is supported by the trades unions. Last January a general strike in the Punta Arenas region, in the south of Chile, was called as a protest against the high cost of living, which was greatly aggravated by the exchange balance against Chile. This strike was the cause of bloody rioting and great destruction of property. It spread into the textile mills and mines all over the country. February 7 was set as the day for a general protest strike. But the govern-

ment promptly declared martial law and all demonstrations were halted. By the first week in September the labor federation was strong enough to call another general strike which lasted four days, and ceased only with the organization of a conciliation court under the direction of the President of the Republic.

This strike was marked for its quiet and orderly conduct. There was no rioting, simply a quiet display of the force that lies behind the demands of organized labor. The newspapers and the letters of business houses all unite in praising the conduct of the men and of their leaders and in emphasizing the need of some sort of action to stabilize exchange. Bills are now being passed providing for the construction of new roads and various public improvements which will give employment to many men and quicken the industrial life of the country.

Of the smaller countries of South America, Peru seems to have had the largest amount of organized protest against present-day conditions. In January the President of Peru issued a decree declaring the eight-hour day the legal working day and providing that all industrial disputes "shall be" decided by arbitration. However, in March the socialist and labor committees in Lima and Callao called a general strike demanding cheaper foodstuffs. There was much looting of shops and martial law was declared. (It is interesting to note that the latest governmental remedy for high prices has been to relieve merchants of all taxes!) In September railway and dock workers and clerks in commercial houses struck for higher wages.

Other Countries

There have been isolated strikes and local unrest in all the South American countries, but the instances cited here are enough to show the drift of events. As a whole, labor in South America has a better realization of modern conditions than have the governing classes. The workers, however, need education and leaders trained to a vision of industrial democracy that shall replace the present system of exploitation of natural resources by foreign capital under foreign management.

An American Labor Party

W. Harris Crook

Some twenty years after the formation of a British Labor Party, and in the face of continued hostility from the conservative leaders of the American Federation of Labor, the sheer logic of facts and the rapidly increasing pressure of the war against organized labor by capital and government has at last compelled the creation of the Labor Party of the United States.

The birthplace of the new party was located in the city of Chicago, where the first annual convention was held from Saturday, November 22 to Tuesday night, November 25. The Ashland Boulevard auditorium of the street carmen's building was the busy scene of the convention. Unfortunately the acoustic properties of the great hall were, literally, beyond words! Much of the speeches from the platform and most of those from the floor of the hall were inaudible to a large number of the delegates present. In the later sessions, moreover, when the first strangeness of the gathering had worn off, the delegates themselves added considerably to the acoustic confusion by their frequent appeals to the chairman, their cries of "Speak louder," or their vociferous demands for "Vote! Vote!"

A vast reserve of enthusiasm lasted even to the final days of the convention, but a growing impatience with the apparent dilatoriness of the resolution and constitution committees gave a superficial impression of indifference to debate when the resolutions actually arrived. The method of merely *reading* each resolution, at high speed, from the platform and the prompt subsequent attempt of Chairman Hayes to rush both the discussion and the vote produced an atmosphere of railroading the convention, which the delegates more than once outspokenly resented. Indeed, far and away the most cheering note of the sessions (and there were many encouraging notes) was the daily growth in the emphatic independence of the

ranks on the floor of the convention. Whatever leaders may come and go in the next twelve months—and much change seems likely—the party itself, judged by the convention, is made up of eager and very determined members.

The Convention's "Make-up"

At least thirty-four of the forty-eight states were represented by delegates, with the predominating attendance coming, naturally enough, from the central states like Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, and Ohio, though New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts each possessed large delegations. California and Washington; Maine, Florida, Louisiana, and New Mexico of the outlying states were there, and Wyoming, most picturesque in full cowboy and "cowgirl" outfit! Miners, railroadmen, and machinists seemed to dominate in numbers, having over 280 delegates present, but every conceivable trade and profession from blacksmithing to nursing was represented from one state or another, and quite a few women delegates among them. The various existent state labor parties were there in full force and the fraternal delegates from the farmers, from the Committee of 48, from the proportional representation group, the coöperative societies, and from Canada, England, and India added much to the interest and the ultimate value of the convention. "Hand and brain" workers alike were represented, stockyard unions and Actors' Equity Association, teamsters' unions and teachers' unions sending their delegates. Above all one noticed in names and in speech the overwhelming English-speaking Americanism of the delegates. Foreign sounding names and foreign accents were alike conspicuous by their rarity.

"Leaders" of outstanding calibre and wide public renown were noticeably lacking—probably a fortunate failing for the real democratic success of the Labor Party.

Wisely enough, the convention decided not to appoint a national "ticket" till a special convention next spring. Less wisely, perhaps, no program or platform was forthcoming, only a very prolix set of "principles" and a very plethora of long-winded resolutions. The advice of the farmer delegates was pointed and weighty with experience, to make the national platform very short and very clear, leaving out the side issues and the hundred and one fads, if the party really desired to achieve the success that has attended the Nonpartisan League.

The Convention Sessions

Saturday was spent in the preliminaries, when John Fitzpatrick welcomed the delegates to Chicago, Max Hayes of Cleveland was appointed permanent chairman of the convention, and the various committees were appointed and the accredited delegates seated. Happily for the accomplishment of good, practical work, Duncan McDonald, president of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, was elected chairman of the Committee on Committees, and no little credit will be due to him if farmers, labor, and other liberal and radical voters in the United States are finally welded into an effective political unity for the next Presidential election. His was one of the few outstanding personalities at the convention; his native humor and his quiet, kindly control over himself and therefore over the delegates was in marked contrast to some of the other "lights" at the sessions.

Sunday was taken up with addresses by fraternal delegates, and a most hospitable welcome was given their varied views. The contrasts here were marked. A Nonpartisan League delegate, clean shaven, spare built, and long-haired, would make telling points in favor of a simple platform that "all could agree on" dealing shrewd and subtle blows first at left wingers and then at right in the interest of labor unity and power. There would follow a heavy-built, gesticulating orator with fog-horn voice and Billy Sunday antics pounding home with sledgehammer

arguments the need for "P. R." in elections methods in order to have the minority vote represented. Then a quiet, well-groomed, gray-haired New York business man with strangely untypical radical views would bring a warm message of sympathy from the "highbrows" of the Committee of 48. Finally a tall, angular, intellectual, with awkwardly waving arms reads a typewritten manuscript while a patient audience hears his demand for "no sectarianism" in the Labor Party and calmly listens to a bitter denunciation of a President (but recently fallen from grace!) who dared utter economic fallacies. The Social Democratic League means little to the average delegate, but they give polite if not excessively enthusiastic applause as the speaker closes.

A mass meeting to protest against government by injunction was held Sunday evening, when every denunciation of Judge Anderson and the government action in the coal strike was received with lightning-swift applause. Plainly the air was electrical with feeling on this question, both at the mass meeting and throughout the whole convention. Judge Anderson might find it hard to "dig coal by injunction," as Duncan McDonald averred, but he assuredly had helped dig the graves of the old-line political parties by his fateful action.

All Monday was spent in awaiting and in rapidly passing resolutions against rule by injunction, the deportation of British Indian politicals from the United States, the "hellish crime of starving the helpless women and children of Russia by the allied blockade," anti-Jewish pogroms in Europe, and in favor of amnesty to American political prisoners, and a retrial for Tom Mooney. Wild applause greeted the names of Debs, Kate O'Hare, and Carl Haessler. The delegates authorized a long petition to Congress dealing in detail with the violation of the Constitution in Judge Anderson's injunction, and begging Congress for the latter's impeachment for "bringing the courts into disrepute and the law into contempt." The convention approved the "New Majority" (editor Rob-

ert Buck, published weekly in Chicago) as the official national party organ, after much opposition from other labor-paper editors and supporters. It adopted the suggestion of the women delegates for equal representation of men and women in the various Labor Party executive committees. It agreed to the formation of a state labor party in each state and the establishment of a speakers' bureau, an educational bureau, travelling libraries and labor colleges with the aim of nationwide political education in labor needs and policies.

Finally, at the tail end of the afternoon session the constitution was adopted, declaring the object of the party to be the organization of "all hand and brain workers of the United States in support of the principles of political, social, and industrial democracy." All workers over 16 years of age without regard to "race, color, sex, or creed" who subscribe to the principles and purposes of the Labor Party are eligible as members. Farmers', coöperative, trade union, and all other organizations which subscribe to the Labor Party principles could affiliate with the state or county labor parties by paying the required per capita tax. The constitution carefully prevented any coquetting with the two old parties such as wrecked the Rooseveltian Progressive movement, by forbidding the endorsement of other parties' candidates and providing for the expulsion of any Labor Party member who accepted nomination of another party. A careful loophole was left for frank working agreements with the oldest workers' political group—the Socialist Party—or the farmers' and workers' groups already existent, provided they supported the Labor Party program and accepted its ideals.

In between the gaps, when no resolution was forthcoming, fraternal delegates addressed the convention, including J. A. H. Hopkins, of the Committee of 48, who declared that his group desired to work with the new labor party if it would adopt such a platform as they could approve in their

own conference at St. Louis, December 13. As on Sunday, any reference to joint action of workers and other radicals was cordially received by the delegates.

On Tuesday Mrs. Monica Ewer, of the British Labor Party, warned the delegates that to gain political power they must earn the support of the farmer and the liberal professional by a broad inclusive platform. This, the last day of the convention, became more and more hectic as the hours drew on and ever more delegates slipped away for home states. A wild rush on the part of the remainder put through the "principles"—some 32 in all—at an evening session. Among these the most vital were (1) a demand for a *workers'* league of nations, open diplomacy, and the abolition of conscription in any form; (2) restoration of free speech and the repeal of the Espionage Law; (3) national ownership of railroads, forests, mines, telegraphs and telephones, stockyards, and other public utilities and basic industries, with the Plumb Plan for the railroads; (4) steeply graduated income tax; (5) abolition of the Senate and popular election of federal judges. Equal representation of men and women on the national executive committee, with one man and one woman from each state on this committee, was also approved by the convention.

A Labor News Service

One of the direct results of the Labor Party Convention, the importance of which is likely to be fully realized only with the lapse of time, was the formation of a genuine federated labor press service linking up Seattle, Butte, Milwaukee, Chicago, New York, London, Paris, and many another vital center for an effective service of real labor news. This press service will provide daily and weekly information to the labor, farmer, and socialist press throughout the United States. Cartoons, biographies of leaders in the workers' movement, picture and foreign news services are all contemplated in the plans of "The Federated Press."

The writer by ill luck of sickness had to travel back to New York by the "greatest train in the world," the Twentieth Century Ltd. Never since the days, five years before, when after a journey in the steerage he had entered America through the grim portals of Ellis Island, had the two Americas so vividly presented themselves as in this short week of convention. In the carmen's auditorium, a great throng of eager, earnest faces, of men and women in their "Sunday best" or their actual working clothes, all pressed by the personal knowledge of the class war and class injustice and the hardship of the cost of living; some of them old stagers in the labor struggle, many of them out and out socialists in political conviction; a burning light of the spirit of American freedom in their eyes and swift and tumultuous welcome in their voices for all well-made points on the need for labor unity. An army with banners, knowing their goal, yet knowing their present weakness and comparative helplessness. The one America—the America that may rule tomorrow.

And the other! As the great "gilt-edged" express pulled out of La Salle depot a stout ex-Englishman cried out to his young American partner, "This country's in a bloody mess! But mark my word we'll pull a hundred thousand dollars out of this!" For twenty hours from end to end of the train it was "Dollars," "Down with the Reds," and "Dollars" again; not a spark, not a glimpse of the spirit of the future in *these* faces—all the very image of Will Dyson's or Art Young's cartoons of the "Fat Man" or of Congressman Baer's "Big Biz."

The stage was set, and the class strife was on, and *these* men knew it far more clearly than those keen black-clad delegates back in the carmen's hall on Ashland Boulevard. These men were united to hold all that the laws and the fortunes of war would allow them; ready to fight to the last ditch for their privileges, but very unready to put forward a true American people's program either in politics or in industry.

Will the ranks of labor learn in time the vital need for their own unity at ballot box and work bench? What of 1920?

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, OF

The Socialist Review

Published monthly at New York, N. Y., for Oct. 1, 1919.
State of New York, } ss:
County of New York, }

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared W. Harris Crook, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the managing editor of the Socialist Review, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:
Publisher—Intercollegiate Socialist Society,

70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Editor—Harry W. Laidler,

Room 930, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Managing Editor—W. Harris Crook,

Room 914, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Business Manager—None.

2. That the owners are: (Give names and addresses of individual owners, or, if a corporation, give its name and the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 per cent. or more of the total amount of stock.)

Intercollegiate Socialist Society, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City; membership approximately 2,000. The principal officers are: President, Florence Kelley, 44 East 23d St., New York City; 1st Vice-President, Evans Clark, 62 Montague St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; 2nd Vice-President, H. W. L. Dana, 105 Brattle St., Cambridge, Mass.; Treasurer, Albert De Silver, 98 Joralemon St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.)

There are no known bondholders, mortgagees or other security holders.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the six months preceding the date shown above is _____. (This information is required from daily publications only.)

W. HARRIS CROOK,
Managing Editor.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 4th day of October, 1919.

M. A. FOWLER.

Notary Public Kings County, No. 2.
Certificate in New York County, No. 12.
Register's No. 10003.
(My commission expires March 30, 1920.)

[SEAL.]

The International Labor Conferences

Caro Lloyd

The handwriting on the wall today shows vivid pictures—on one hand of mass action by the workers, hundreds of thousands of whom are standing with folded arms, and on the other, of rulers summoning conferences of eminent individuals to decide the workers' fate by draft conventions. November waved out President Wilson's ill-starred Industrial Conference and ushered in the International Labor Conference provided for by the League of Nations Treaty to establish a uniform international labor policy. Its four-week session in Washington, October 29 to November 29, was the first practical application of the new international politique. Delegates coming from all over the world, realizing their unique mission, were surprised to find the United States Senate killing the Treaty and its chief protagonist, President Wilson, too ill to welcome them. Under these chilling conditions the Conference opened. Membership was confined to two government, one employer, one labor delegate from each nation which had ratified the Treaty. However, since the League was not yet created and the Conference only semi-organized, special rulings admitted representatives from forty nations. Although the United States could not vote, Secretary Wilson was made permanent chairman, and the American Federation of Labor and the Chamber of Commerce were each invited to send a delegate. Samuel Gompers, representing labor, attended only once or twice, and the Chamber of Commerce ignored the invitation. Russia, to so many millions the star in the East, was barred. Of the "late enemy states," the Austrians declined and the German delegates turned home on the eve of sailing as it was too late. Australian official labor, the main body of labor, refused to name a delegate.¹

¹Among the reasons given by the Sydney Labor Council were the following: "That the League of Nations is not a league of free peoples, but merely an alliance of self-appointed members of capitalistic governments; that the composition of

Dispute Over Hours

Of the twenty-four official members of the Conference twenty were from Europe, a condition against which strong protest was raised. Composed of races of varying ideals, differing widely in degree of industrial development, and with translation hanging like a millstone about its neck, it was unwieldy and slow. Its agenda, outlined by the treaty, dealt mainly with the duration of the work-day and conditions of employment. The draft convention calling for the 8-hour day and the 48-hour week was exhaustively debated in and out of committee. The labor group at a separate meeting reported for a 44 or 46-hour week. Gompers told the Conference that the United States workers were standing for a 44-hour week, and pointed to accumulated experience that more work was turned out in an 8 than in a 10 or 12-hour day.

The convention resolution as passed called for the adoption of the 8-hour day and the 48-hour week, with provisos that if hours were redistributed, no day was to exceed 9 hours, in continuous processes a 56-hour week limit, overtime to be paid not less than time and a quarter and special conditions for labor in the devastated regions. The difficulty lay in adapting it to the eastern nations, South Africa and tropical America. The committee recommended that India be asked to adopt the 60-hour week for industries under the factory acts, mines, branches of iron and railway

the Labor Conference is entirely unsatisfactory, and its powers illusory, as capitalistic governments will possess an overwhelming preponderance of representation; that the appointment of the labor nominees by the governments concerned instead of by the massed votes of organized workers, is anti-democratic; that the indorsements by the Trades and Labor Council of these proposals would have the effect of making the workers of New South Wales morally bound to accept and uphold the decisions arrived at; that Mr. Hughes' government has lent itself to a transparent and pernicious plot to hoodwink and deceive the workers of Australia; that nothing will prevent the workers from obtaining economic justice by the vigorous use of every means at their command."

works, that China be recommended to frame labor legislation and report to the next conference on its stand for a 60-hour week for adults, 48 for minors under 15, with a weekly rest day. As to Japan, the Conference regarded it as impracticable to apply western standards, except in coal mining, and recommended a temporary convention for a 9-hour day or 57-hour week, except in silk which called for a 60-hour week.

The Conference witnessed an angry debate in the Japanese delegation on this point, the labor group charging that such a ruling was unnecessary and served the interest of autocracy, and declaring that its government was completely controlled by the capitalists. A minority report circulated by this group contained a bitter indictment of the government in its treatment of labor and formed a damaging answer to its assertion of the need for a longer workday.

On the employment of women and children, the Conference ruled the prohibition of night work between 10 p. m. and 5 a. m. for all women, through the substitution of a modernized and enlarged convention for that adopted at Berne in 1906. Eastern countries are prepared to adhere to this. It further ruled for the prohibition of the employment of children under 14, except that Japan has agreed and India has been asked to raise the limit from 9 to 12, with 14 as the eventual standard. An effort was made by the labor group of the Conference to make the age limit 15 or 16. A six weeks leave of absence for wage-earning mothers both before and after childbirth was also ruled, with payment for time lost either by the state or by some form of insurance. All of the Conference proceedings have been printed in English, French and Spanish.

A Permanent Body

A permanent International Labor Office was created, with Albert Thomas of France Director-General, and a governing body, with Arthur Fontaine of the French Department of Labor, president, composed of twelve government, six labor and six capitalist representatives, delegates from the United States

and Germany to come in later. Among its functions will be to serve as a clearing house for labor information, to register laws and to prepare agenda for the annual conferences.

The Conference has apparently slight power to enforce its findings. Each member state agrees to present its rulings to its legislative authority within one year. Should this body refuse to endorse, the state is not bound. If, however, it ratifies and does not carry out, then the state will be complained of before a committee of inquiry and be subject to punishment, such as the boycott. The offending nation may appeal to the permanent Court of International Justice.

While it is undoubtedly an advance that the world's problems are here brought into the realm of reason, it is true that an evaluation of the Conference must measure it in relation to the present crisis. In the acute stage of the capital and labor struggle today, no solutions are of great moment which do not touch the causes. In its opportunistic effort to get immediate practical results, the Conference may prove to have been most impractical. Delegate Barnes said that its limitations were its strength, that after years of legislative success it would be possible to deal safely with such fundamental subjects as collective bargaining, but that now it would mean disaster. But he should be reminded that while his palliatives are being applied at ox-team pace, the crisis is whirling with aeroplane speed. Vice-President Marshall in addressing the Conference is reported to have made the timely remark that he objected to legislation in favor of what are called "the laboring classes" because he objected to the use of the word "classes" "in a world where God made man" and urged the delegates to solve their problems in amity. That the Conference followed this spirit is evident from the complaint of Gino Baldesi, Italian labor delegate, that whenever a difference of opinion arose, some one moved to adjourn. Thus with its head in the sand, the Conference ignored the class struggle looming so large on all sides. Beyond this negative quality, may it not prove to hold a positive men-

ace? Just as the newer countries had a foretaste of their relative subjection under the League to the dominant powers, so may not labor see here an international iron rule to be applied with all the compulsion possessed by the great capitalist nations?

The International Congress of Working-women

Simultaneously with the opening of the Labor Conference was held, also in Washington, the first International Congress of Workingwomen, called by the Women's Trade Union League of America, and attended by delegates from twelve nations. With no representation in the Labor Conference accorded them, the world's working women were limited by the Treaty to the traditional feminine role of advisers. Their Congress, which possessed the distinction not shared by the larger conference of being self-inspired, was accordingly more homogeneous, knew what it wanted, and with admirable directness accomplished in a week's session its aim—to present to the Conference a program of reconstruction for women in industry. The resolutions passed for that purpose prescribed, (1), that no child under 16 be employed in industry, none between 16 and 18 in hazardous industries, and no minor between the hours of 9 p. m. and 6 a. m.; (2), an 8-hour work day and 44-hour week, with one day and a half of uninterrupted rest; (3), no night work for women and only for men in continuous industries essential to public services;

(4), no women in hazardous occupations, research work being recommended with a view to eliminating poisonous substances in dangerous trades; (5), free employment service and unemployment insurance, the International Office to coördinate the research work of national labor departments on possible causes of unemployment, such as the distribution of raw material, migration, labor turnover, and bad management, and in all national and local offices one woman to serve as director of departments relating to women; (6), no woman to be employed six weeks before and six weeks after childbirth, an adequate monetary allowance to be given during that period, and national and international bureaus established for study of the subject.

The Congress also asked that Article III of the Treaty be amended to admit of an equal representation of women in future conferences, and registered a vigorous protest against the Russian blockade. A permanent bureau was provided for and a provisional committee appointed to carry on the work with Mrs. Raymond Robins, president, Mrs. Maud Swartz, secretary-treasurer, and vice-presidents Jeanne Bouvier for the Latin peoples, Betzy Kjelsberg for Scandinavia and Finland, Mme. Louisa Stychova for Slavic women and Mary MacArthur for Anglo-Saxon. One place was left for a member from the Central Powers. Through all its deliberations, the Congress was manifestly inspired by the vision of the new International, which is to replace our present rivalry and waste by efficient and brotherly coöperation.

Socialist Review Calendar

NOVEMBER

- 8th. GERMANY. BERLIN. Noske arrests strike leaders (metal workers) and declares Workers' Councils abolished.
SIBERIA. VLADIVOSTOK. Revolt against Kolchak government led by Gen. Gaida (late commander of Czecho-Slovak army), but suppressed by Allied representatives . . . so Peking cable.
11th. U. S. A. WASHINGTON, D. C. House of Representatives votes 309 to 1 to refuse seat to Victor Berger.

NOVEMBER

- MINNEAPOLIS, MINN. First national convention American Legion demands deportation of Victor Berger, and favors universal military training.
MAGNOLIA, ARK. Negro burned in public square.
CENTRALIA, WASH. Armistice Day paraders attack I. W. W. hall; 3 ex-soldiers killed in struggle; crowd lynches one of I. W. W.
IRELAND. DUBLIN. British government arrests three Sinn Fein M. P.s.

NOVEMBER

- 12th. U. S. A. Railroad brotherhoods and 13 rail unions' leaders demand government control of roads continued at least two years after peace proclamation.
- 13th. GREAT BRITAIN. DURHAM. John Lawson, labor candidate, returned to Parliament on platform of nationalization of industry by majority of 12,525.
- 14th. U. S. A. NEW YORK. James Larkin, Irish labor leader, and Benjamin Gitlow, former socialist assemblyman, held in \$15,000 bail on charge of criminal anarchy. (Alleged assistance in publication of Communist Labor Party manifesto.)
- 15th. MEXICO. PUEBLA. U. S. consular agent Wm. O. Jenkins arrested on charge of connivance with bandit "kidnapper" Cordova. SIBERIA. VLADIVOSTOK. Czecho-Slovak army informs Allies that the "military authorities at Omsk (Kolchak government) are permitting criminal actions that will stagger the entire world, burning of villages, murder of masses of peaceful inhabitants, shooting of hundreds of persons of democratic convictions." They demand safe conduct to Europe.
- 16th. U. S. A. BOSTON, MASS. C. L. U. appoints committee of coöperation with state A. F. of L. to defeat anti-strike legislation pending.
- MOBERLY, Mo. Mob lynches negro alleged to have robbed farmer.
- GREAT BRITAIN. LONDON. General Secretary J. H. Thomas of National Union of Railroadmen declares government proposes railroads be managed by joint committee of executives on which workers would have three representatives with powers equal to general managers.
- BELGIUM. Socialists elect 70 members to Parliament, receiving vote of 644,500.
- ESTHONIA. DORPAT. Litvinoff with three other Bolshevik peace envoys arrives. Yudenitch resigns command of N. W. Russian army (anti-Bolshevik).
- 17th. U. S. A. ST. LOUIS, Mo. Charging Geo. L. Berry, president of International Printing Pressmen's Union, with "misappropriation of more than \$200,000," union pressmen from 27 cities in convention secede and organize new union.
- 19th. GREAT BRITAIN. LONDON. Parliament withdraws unemployment pay from civilians.
- 20th. U. S. A. NEW YORK. Pres. Loree of Delaware and Hudson railroad at Hotel Astor demands open shop and suspension of credit by shopkeepers during strikes.
- 21st. U. S. A. WASHINGTON, D. C. Pres. Wilson

NOVEMBER

- calls new industrial conference of seventeen consisting of two former attorneys general, three college professors, three former governors, one railroad official, several business men and lawyers, with Sec. of Labor Wilson. No representatives of labor.
- ITALY. Final election returns give Socialists 156 seats.
- 22nd. U. S. A. CHICAGO, ILL. Government control of finance, railroads and packing industry, coöperative program of farmers and labor, adopted at final session of conference of Farmers' National Council.
- BOGALUSA, LA. Loyalty Leaguers kill L. E. Williams, district president of A. F. of L., and two other union carpenters for protecting negro union organizer against mob. Carpenters' Union protests to Attorney General Palmer.
- 23rd. U. S. A. READING, PA. Mayor Filbert forbids Debs amnesty meeting for fear of American Legion riot.
- WASHINGTON, D. C. Gompers declares that President Wilson through the Secretary of Labor, Attorney General Gregory, Food Commissioner Hoover, Representative Lever and others pledged that the Lever Act would not be used against labor.
- 24th. U. S. A. NEW YORK. Wm. McAdoo calls increases asked by miners "just and reasonable." States that many mine operators made "shocking and indefensible profits on bituminous coal" in 1917 ranging from 15% to 2,000%.
- CHICAGO, ILL. The Labor Party of the United States formally created in convention. Impeachment of Federal Judge Anderson demanded, also lifting of blockade on Russia, and release of Debs, O'Hare, Haessler, and all political prisoners.
- 25th. U. S. A. CHICAGO, ILL. Labor Party convention adopts program. (See article.)
- NEW YORK. L. C. A. K. Martens of Russian Soviet Bureau testifies before Lusk Committee that Soviet government stands ready to pay its debts in U. S. money.
- 26th. U. S. A. NEW YORK. Justice Gavegan upholds Supreme Court Justice McAvoy's dismissal of suit by N. Y. State for annulment of Rand School charter.
- WASHINGTON, D. C. Japanese workers' delegates at international labor conference denounce their government's delegates for their opposition to a 48-hour week.
- LAFAYETTE, IND. Scott Nearing prevented from addressing C. L. U. mass meeting for amnesty by injunction issued at request of American Legion.

NOVEMBER

- 27th. U. S. A. WASHINGTON, D. C. Mine leaders refuse Garfield's offer of only 14% wage increase.
- 28th. GERMANY. BERLIN. Independent Socialists elect Alfred Henke and Fritz Geyer of the left wing with equal right to succeed Hugo Haase as leader.
- 29th. U. S. A. NEW YORK. End of four-day hunger and silence strike of alleged anarchists at Ellis Island.
Frederic C. Howe appears before immigration committee of House of Representatives to answer charges of laxity in dealing with radical aliens, but is denied a hearing.
MICHIGAN. Senator Newberry, successful candidate in 1918 election against Henry Ford, indicted with 134 others by Federal Grand Jury on charges of corruption, fraud, and conspiracy.

DECEMBER

- 1st. U. S. A. Bradstreets estimates that prices have risen 131% over those obtaining August 1st, 1914.
WASHINGTON, D. C. Senator LaFollette urges five-year retention of railroads by government.
FALL RIVER, MASS. 35,000 textile workers strike. Are granted a wage increase of 12½%.
CHICAGO, ILL. Wage increase of 7 to 15% granted to over 100,000 employes in packing industry by Judge Alschuler.
ITALY. Directors of Italian Socialist Party pass resolution declaring socialist victories "an act of complete solidarity with Soviet Republic of Russia."
GREAT BRITAIN. Government reduces coal ten shillings per ton, proving labor right in its opposition to the six shilling per ton increase of July, 1919.
- 2nd. U. S. A. CHICAGO, ILL. Chas. E. Ruthenberg (Exec. Sec. Communist Party) and I. E. Ferguson (former Natl. Sec. of Left Wing, Soc. Party) arrested charged with criminal anarchy.
NEW YORK. James P. Holland, president N. Y. State Federation of Labor, opposed for years by progressive members of the A. F. of L., announces active campaign to drive "radicals" from ranks of State organization.
CANAL ZONE. U. S. officials prevent union organizers from landing, though possessing U. S. passports.
ITALY. ROME. Orlando elected president of

DECEMBER

- Chamber of Deputies by vote of 251 to 143 gained by socialist deputy Lazarria.
SIBERIA. IRKUTSK. New "All Russian" ministry formed by late Omsk government to regain popular support for Kolchak.
- 3rd. U. S. A. SEATTLE, WASH. Anna Louise Strong ("Anise"), E. B. Ault, Listman and Rust, all of the *Seattle Union Record*, arrested on charge of violation of amended Espionage Law.
- 4th. U. S. A. NEW YORK. Health Commissioner Copeland reported as declaring 300,000 children under-nourished in the city "are ready to become victims of tuberculosis."
WASHINGTON, D. C. Postmaster Burleson in annual report urges repeal of law permitting federal workers to affiliate with labor organizations.
Federal Trade Commission charges "Big Five" packers of Chicago with purchase of 31 food and supply corporations.
INDIANAPOLIS. Contempt of court charges against 84 leaders of United Mine Workers of America for alleged violation of the Anderson injunction.
MISSOURI. Governor Gardner by proclamation seizes 15 coal mines in Barton County.
ITALY. Ten persons dead and 1,000 arrested as result of general strike declared in protest against anti-socialist demonstrations in Rome Dec. 1st.
- 5th. U. S. A. DONORA, PA. State police raid Lithuanian Hall, headquarters of steel strike in district, arrest 98 men and hold them in \$500 bail each. Police ride their horses up steps and down aisles of hall to make arrests. Conspiracy to prevent men from working the charge.
- 6th. SPAIN. MADRID. Toca Cabinet resigns. Socialist deputies threaten general strike if it is replaced by military government.
- 7th. U. S. A. SPRINGFIELD, MASS. American Legion threatens riot if St. John Tucker speaks. Chief of Police requests him to cancel engagement.
- 8th. U. S. A. WASHINGTON, D. C. Attorney General Palmer in report to Congress declares "the present unrest and tendency toward radicalism arises from social and economic conditions that are of greater consequence than the individual agitator."
MILWAUKEE, WIS. Victor Berger nominated in primary by vote of 14,000 against fusion candidate Bodenstab's 9,282.
- 9th. U. S. A. LAWRENCE, MASS. William A. Wood, president of the American Woolen Company, threatens local stores with a com-

pany department store to sell at cost to his 20,000 workers if prices do not fall. Storekeepers comment on the profits of the Amer. Woolen Co. in reply.

ST. LOUIS, MO. Committee of 48 meets in Hotel Statler, after refusal of the ball-room had been quashed by injunction. Local Dept. of Justice men alleged refusal of room due to threats of American Legion members, but local head denies official opposition.

- 10th. U. S. A. ITHACA, N. Y. Mob of American Legion men cut electric wires during Fritz Kreisler's concert. Latter continues to play for 40 minutes in dark to enthusiastic audience. Mayor Frank Davis supports American Legion by requesting citizens not to attend concert.

INDIANAPOLIS. Leaders of United Mine Workers of America vote to accept Pres. Wilson's settlement of 14% wage increase and commission of three, representing miners, operators and public, to readjust wages and prices.

GREAT BRITAIN. LONDON. Trades Union Congress demands government immediately consider peace offer made by Soviet Russia. Also demand permission for labor delegation to visit Russia to investigate actual conditions.

ITALY. ROME. Socialist deputy Pro. Grazzadei asserts Entente "recruits adventurers against Russia and starves Russian women and children."

- 11th. U. S. A. NEW YORK. Socialist Party national executive committee pledge party's undivided support to Russian workers' government.

IRELAND, DUBLIN. Thos. Kelly, Sinn Fein M.P., arrested and carried off to English port by British government.

- 12th. U. S. A. NEW YORK. American Women's Emergency Committee parade Wall Street district with posters protesting blockade of Soviet Russia.

WASHINGTON, D. C. A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods' "reconstruction conference" meets.

ST. LOUIS, MO. Committee of 48 in national convention adopt unanimously three-plank platform of public ownership of public utilities and natural resources; no land or patents to be held for speculation; equal economic and political rights for all, with restoration of free speech and abolition of injunction in labor disputes.

SOCIALIST REVIEW CALENDAR

RUSSIA. KHARKOV. Bolsheviks capture this, one of Denikin's military bases.

- 13th. U. S. A. PITTSBURGH. Allegheny County Bar Association presents petition for disbarment of Jacob Margolis on charge of radicalism. AUSTRIAN REPUBLIC. Dr. Karl Renner, Chancellor, tells Associated Press he must get Allied assurances of food for Austria or resign.

- 15th. U. S. A. HUNTINGDON, W. VA. Automobile mob seizes from deputy sheriffs' protection, and lynch, two negroes.

FRANCE. PARIS. Kolchak reported as ready to cede Siberian land to Japan if Allies do not support the White armies.

ARGENTINA. BUENOS AIRES. Cable reports U. S. government suggests that South America join in espionage system against radicals.

- 16th. U. S. A. WASHINGTON, D. C. Cong. Albert Johnson of Washington offers bill, drastically amending immigration laws, with "anti-red" purpose.

U. S. A. INDIANAPOLIS. Alexander Howat (who recently accompanied Social Democratic League to Europe to "counteract war neurasthenia"), president Kansas district U. M. W. A., charged with continued violation of Anderson injunction.

- 19th. MILWAUKEE, WIS. Berger elected.

College Notes

The *Adelphi* Chapter has sent in the names of eight new members. The members have been making a study of Trade Unions, and, on Friday, December 12th, Leland Olds addressed them on this subject. They plan to use *The Socialist Review* as a basis for future chapter discussions.

At *Barnard* the I. S. S. members have joined forces with the International Polity League and the Young Women's Council. Miss Gladys Boone of England, fraternal delegate from the University Socialist Federation, is very interested in their work and writes that the students will probably form an I. S. S. group within this organization. Miss Boone secured Mr. B. N. Langdon-Davies and Mr. W. N. Ewer as speakers for one of the December meetings. These groups plan to have Walter Lippmann speak on 'Some Phases of the Peace Treaty' during the month.

The *University of California* Chapter has a large enrollment and an active executive committee of eleven members. The secretary writes that, although restricted in the matter of securing speakers, the club has held a number of interesting discussions led by members of the group, and has been addressed by several professors.

The *Cornell* Chapter is doing excellent work. "Our meetings are very well attended. Whereas a dozen or two students used to come out last year, we now get at least 200," writes Ralph Shemin, the secretary. At one meeting during the month the Chapter announced a general discussion on "The Injunction in the Miner's Strike," and the hall was packed. Another successful meeting was held with Mrs. Monica Ewer as speaker.

Joseph Turkel of *Harvard* writes that a group of students there have formed an organization whose purpose is to bring to the college well-known speakers on important topics of the day. They are anxious to have I. S. S. speakers address them.

The *State University of Iowa* has just organized and has been granted a charter. The name of the group is the Social Reconstruction Club, and John Evanoff is the secretary. He writes that the Chapter has discussions every two weeks, the first topic being "The Materialistic Conception of History and Marxian Dialectics."

The *University of Michigan* is doing good work and has sent in dues and subscriptions for twelve new members. Charles A. Madison, the secretary, has secured several well-known speakers to address the group, and recently arranged a successful meeting for Mr. B. N. Langdon-Davies, who spoke to the students on "The Children of the New World—A Plea for Democracy in Education."

A group of 30 or 40 students at *N. Y. U. Law*, under the leadership of George O. Arkin, have signed up to form an I. S. S. chapter, and are awaiting only the approval of the college authorities to go ahead with their organization.

Ohio State University has a live chapter which recently arranged a good meeting for Mr. W. Harris Crook. Sonya Forthal is president, Mildred Vermillion, secretary.

The *Radcliffe Chapter* is doing active work under the leadership of Miss Belle Stafford. Mr. Crook addressed them in November on the present labor unrest.

The *Simmons College* group has decided to join forces with the Social and Civics League of that college for the purpose of securing speakers. They will, however, keep their I. S. S. identity, and hold meetings of their own. Mr. Harris Crook spoke awhile ago before several of the economics classes of that college.

Vassar has a star Chapter this year, with 41 paid up members. Elinor Hill Weed is president, and Marian Thayer, secretary. They have already held several well-attended meetings. Several hundred members and friends listened in Decem-

ber to one of Florence Kelley's instructive addresses.

The *University of Wisconsin* has an indefatigable secretary, David Weiss. Recently Mr. B. N. Langdon-Davies visited the college and spoke before Professor Commons' class on "British Labor Leaders," to the Department of Journalism on "Democracy and the Press," and to a packed hall in the evening on "Labor and Liberty." His message was enthusiastically received, and his visit resulted in some fifteen new members joining the Society (thirty-one paid-up members having been previously reported). Later the same week the group assisted the Open Forum Society in arranging a rousing meeting for Raymond Robins.

The Social Problems Club of *C. C. N. Y.* has recently listened to addresses by Gilbert Cannan, Algernon Lee, Felix Grendon, and Allan McCurdy.

The *Yale* group recently arranged to have Mr. Holford Knight speak before the Yale Thursday Dinner Club. They plan to have Mr. Wilfred Humphries speak at a meeting in January.

At the *University of Pittsburgh* Mr. Crook recently addressed a number of economics classes.

The *Boston Alumni* Chapter plans an interesting series of conferences during the year. Among the topics and speakers will be: "Socialism of Today," Scott Nearing; "History, Organization, and Present Policies and Tendencies of the A. F. of L.," Silvester McBride; "Nationalization of the Railroads of the United States," Glenn E. Plumb; "The Growth of Radical Unions in the United States," A. J. Muste; "Nationalization of Industry in England," Paul U. Kellogg; "The Church and the Socialization of Industry," John Haynes Holmes. Helen Henry Hodge is secretary. The chapter on November 7 held a successful dinner, with Florence Kelley, Wm. Kruse, W. Harris Crook, and H. W. L. Dana as speakers.

The *Los Angeles Alumni* Chapter, writes Esther Yarnell, is working with the Woman's Shelley Club. They conduct successful Sunday afternoon forums, and have opened some pleasant reading rooms.

The *New York Alumni* Chapter is holding weekly supper classes in addition to the Saturday Camaraderies. The classes are held Wednesday evening from 6:40 to 8:10 p. m. At present Gregory Zilboorg is giving a course on "Current Events in Russia."

Recent speakers at the Camaraderies have been Wilfred Humphries on "Russia," Crystal Eastman on "Hungary," Dr. John Mez on "Mexico," Helena Van Brugh DeKay on "Romain Rolland," Alice Riggs Hunt on "European Labor Leaders," and Gilbert Cannan, who read one of his plays. A

Steel Strike Committee of the N. Y. A. C. has been raising funds for the steel strikers and has issued a circular.

Wilfred Humphries made a very successful tour for the I. S. S. during the first part of December. He spoke on "Eleven Months in Soviet Russia," in some cases showing his slides, in others dealing with the economic structure of the present government, illustrating it with diagrams. The trip began with a good meeting at Vassar and a highly interesting meeting at Berkeley Divinity in Middletown followed. At Mt. Holyoke he spoke before a merger of two big economics classes. At Massachusetts Agricultural College, Mr. Humphries addressed the Senior and Freshman economics classes and another class of Professor Sprague's. He was also given a cordial reception at Amherst, where he spoke before Professor Hamilton's senior economics class. Over 700 students and members of the faculty were present at a meeting arranged by Miss Ada Comstock, Dean of Smith College, over which Professor Fay presided.

Mr. Humphries also spoke three times at Clark University, before a meeting of the Social and Civics League, at Simmons College, at a meeting

arranged by a group of students of Harvard, an I. S. S. meeting at Radcliffe, and a mass meeting at Wellesley. In addition, Mr. Humphries had many interesting conferences with individual professors and students.

Mrs. Alice K. Boehme, the efficient Executive Secretary of the I. S. S. from 1912 to 1919, resigned from the Society a short time ago, her husband, Dr. T. Boehme, having accepted a position in one of the educational institutions of Mexico. "During the critical days in the Society, as well as in its less difficult tasks," ran the resolution of the Executive Committee appreciative of the work of the Executive Secretary and expressing the Society's deep regret at the loss to the Society, "you have served the Society with a singleness of purpose, an efficiency, an unselfish loyalty of the highest order, and those of the Committee who have had the privilege of working with you will always cherish the memory of that co-partnership, and of your loyal friendship."

JESSICA SMITH.

Mrs. Boehme's successor to the position of Executive Secretary, Miss Jessica Smith of Swarthmore, 1915, has been active in the suffrage, socialist, and peace movements.

I. S. S. CHRISTMAS CONVENTION, NEW YORK CITY, DEC. 29-30TH.
SEE SOCIETY'S ANNOUNCEMENT.

Your New Year's Resolutions!

Resolved: That, if a non-member, I shall consider it my first duty of the New Year to affiliate myself with the Intercollegiate Socialist Society.

Resolved: That I shall aid the Membership Campaign of the I. S. S. by inducing at least five of my friends to join the Society within the next sixty days, and, wherever possible, shall organize I. S. S. city and college groups.

Resolved: That I shall contribute as generously as my means will permit to the educational work of the I. S. S. during the present college year.

Membership. Dues \$3 a year for active (collegian) and auxiliary (non-collegian) membership. This includes subscription to THE SOCIALIST REVIEW. Purpose of Society: "to promote an intelligent interest in Socialism among college men and women." All interested in learning more about Socialism and fundamental social problems or in assisting others to learn the truth about these subjects are eligible for membership. Officers: Florence Kelley, Cornell, President; Evans Clark, Amherst, Vice-President; H. W. L. Dana, Harvard, Second Vice-President; Albert De Silver, Yale, Treasurer; Harry W. Laidler, Wesleyan, Secretary; Jessica Smith, Swarthmore, Executive Secretary.

The Intercollegiate Socialist Society

70 Fifth Avenue

New York City

Meeting A World Need

Our readers received with acclamation the December issue of

The Socialist Review

"When it arrived I found myself reading it through with a feeling of keen interest and delighted approval. It was a splendid number. Keep it up."

REV. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, New York.

"The article on the Steel strike was well worth the price of the magazine."

R. H. P., Newton, Kansas.

"Copy of the first issue received. Hearty congratulations! The Socialist Review Calendar is particularly good."

E. S., Washington, D. C.

"You have indeed hit the nail on the top by recognizing the urgent need which exists for a really serious, *constructive* review of the highest possible *international* standard."

R. G., Geneva, Switzerland.

"In quantity of radical reading matter we are overloaded, but in quality, deficient. THE SOCIALIST REVIEW seems to promise much in remedying the defect. In fact it is almost a handbook on present conditions throughout the world, and places the average person where he can go forward without having mentally to cover old ground."

AN ASSISTANT STATE SECRETARY SOCIALIST PARTY.

The December issue contained among others, articles by America's socialist-inventor, Chas. P. Steinmetz, on "Socialism and Invention"; by Arthur Gleason and John MacLean on British labor; by Francis Ahern on Australia's labor movement; a résumé of socialist history in America up to the present by Harry W. Laidler; and a brilliant plea for "Freedom in the Workshop," by Felix Grendon. Each month contains a valuable summary of the previous weeks in the Socialist Review Calendar.

The Socialist Review

a monthly journal of information regarding the socialist and labor movement, authoritative in its facts, international in its scope, is just the type of magazine you can advantageously hand on to your comrades in the college, the office and the workshop. Send a dollar and your friend's address for a four-month acquaintance subscription, or \$2.50 for a year.

Published by the

INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Room 914, Educational Building

70 Fifth Avenue

::

New York, N. Y.

25 Cents a Copy

\$2.50 a Year

Make all checks or money orders payable to The Socialist Review